The Forum

MAY, 1897.

THE PROGRESSIVE INHERITANCE TAX.

It has become the fashion in certain quarters to speak of any person who proposes a change in our present inequitable tax system as one who advocates communism, populism, or at least socialism,—hoping thereby to bury a great issue beneath a weight of popular prejudice. I disclaim any connection or sympathy with these "isms"; but, as a result of my experience as Comptroller of the State of New York, I have become more and more impressed—I had almost said oppressed—with the growing inequality of taxation. In view of this fact, it will not be out of place to submit briefly to fair-minded criticism some of the reasons that have led me to believe that a change in the taxing system is necessary, and that a graduated progressive inheritance tax on personal property, which may be imposed upon the devolution of property, is in accord with (*a*) economic science; (*b*) enlightened and advanced national policy; and (*c*) the principles of justice.

(*a*) The earliest science of taxation justified the imposition of a property tax, upon the theory of benefit received or service rendered; in other words, the theory held that each person should be taxed according to the benefit received from the government, or that he should pay to the government the cost of the service rendered by the government for him. Adam Smith regarded the "benefit" or "service" theory as logically leading to proportionality in taxation, and that under such theory each person would be taxed according to the value of his property. Many other economists have arrived at the same conclusion. Proportionality of taxation, based upon the "benefit" or "ser-

Copyright, 1896, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to re-publish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vice" theory, therefore, became at one time the ideal to be sought in taxation; and the influence of that school is felt to-day. It is true that if this ideal were even approximated to in actual practice, far less cause for complaint would exist; and it is equally true that to-day the highest purpose of the practical man in dealing with the question of taxation is generally to attain to something like proportionality. But from the beginning many eminent economic writers disputed the assertion that the "benefit" or "service" theory led to proportionality; and, as modern society developed and wealth increased, it became more and more evident that they were right. The rich largely protect their own property by their hired servants; they educate their children; and in their independence and exclusiveness do many other things for themselves which the public does for the less fortunate. In these later times, however, the benefits conferred upon the average citizen by the government have been greatly increased. Free schools have been established and extended; charities designed to help almost every human misfortune are open to all; and in many other ways gratuitous aid is given to the poorest citizen. Thus the benefits which the government confers upon the rich man, or the service which it renders him, clearly do not increase proportionally with his wealth. To justify taxation, therefore, some new theory was necessary; and modern economic science says that we should pay taxes because we are a part of the government, and, in strengthening and supporting that which is so important a part of ourselves, we contribute to our own security, advantage, and happiness. Reasonable consideration should consequently be given to that which will best serve the entire state. Taxation is a necessity of government; but that necessity should be met by an equitable distribution of the burden. And the burden should be so adjusted as to be the least onerous; the weight being placed, within reasonable limitations, where it can be most easily borne.

The "faculty" or "ability" theory follows logically from this idea, —that taxes should be distributed somewhat according to men's ability to pay them. The propriety of the application of this theory, and the injustice of a proportional tax have been often illustrated. A tax of 10 per cent taken from an income of $500 may deprive a man and his family of some of the necessaries of life; while a tax of 10 per cent taken from an income of $100,000 would deprive no one of anything except expensive luxuries, or an addition to wealth. It is not to the highest interest of the state that the physical comforts of the family

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose income is only $500 should be thus limited, nor is it to the interest of any constituent part of the state; and every person who can do so should assist in preventing it. Higher civilization is marked by a greater diversity of wants; and the best policy of the state is not to make the rich richer, but to help the man of small or moderate means, in order that he may enjoy more of the comforts and advantages of civilization: hence some of the burden which proportional taxation would place on the man whose income is only $500 should be placed on the "ability" of the $100,000 man to pay. It has been said that there should be something like an equality of sacrifice between them. Lincoln's homely expression, "It is easier to pay a large sum when you have it than a small sum when you have n't it," has a vein of modern political economy in it. This idea did not originate with the socialist: it was the thought of the political economist and the humanitarian.

It does not follow from this that the whole tax should be borne by the rich. Every person should contribute something to the support of the government under which he lives: his appreciation of its favors and value is increased by reasonable sacrifices which he is compelled to make for it. Again, no taxation should be so burdensome as to weaken the desire to acquire wealth. That desire, held within proper limits, must always be recognized as a great factor in national prosperity; nor should such taxes be so burdensome as to encourage wholesale evasion or transfer of property. These and many other economic laws form a safeguard against any radical or confiscatory tax. John Stuart Mill, in his "Political Economy," says:—

> "I conceive that inheritances and legacies exceeding a certain amount are highly proper subjects for taxation, and that the revenue from them should be as great as can be made without giving rise to evasions by donations during life, or concealment of property, such as it would be impossible adequately to check. The principle of graduation (as it is called), that is, levying a larger percentage on a larger sum, though its application to general taxation would be, in my opinion, objectionable, seems to me both just and expedient as applied to inheritance and legacy duties."

Prof. Seligman, of Columbia University, whose writings on questions of taxation are most logical, exhaustive, and clear, and of which I have made use says, in his "Progressive Taxation" (p. 215):—

> "From the standpoint both of production and consumption true equality of taxable faculty means progressive taxation of inheritances. Moreover, scarcely any of the objections which attach to the progressive rate in our general property tax applies here. The third argument is what we have termed a special compensatory argument. This alone would suffice, even if the other arguments were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inadequate; for, even granting that proportion is the ideal to be kept in view, it may be said, with some measure of truth, that our existing taxes fall with less severity on the wealthy class. Not only are many of our indirect taxes regressive in their nature, but the general property tax in its practical application is scarcely less objectionable in this respect. A progressive rate in the succession duties, especially where personalty is concerned, would simply tend to reëstablish the desired proportionality. . . . It is the function of progressive taxation not so much to obtain increased revenue as to apportion the burden more equally among the taxpayers."

Quotations might be multiplied indefinitely. Among others who regard a progressive inheritance tax as wise and just may be mentioned such eminent economists and statesmen as Prof. Ely, of Johns Hopkins University; Prof. West, of Columbia College; Sir William Vernon Harcourt; Pierson, the distinguished Dutch professor and minister of finance; Cohen-Stuart, Buckingham, Neumann, Meyer, and many others. These gentlemen are not socialists; indeed nearly all of them have taken strong ground against socialism and communism.

It may perhaps have escaped the memory of the American of the present day that the United States income tax of the Civil War was progressive, varying at last from 5 to 10 per cent; and no less a person than Secretary Fessenden defended the principle and recommended its extension on the ground that "the ability to pay increased in more than arithmetical proportion." Thus it will be seen that, while the student has produced the theory, such practical and eminent statesmen as Fessenden, Harcourt, and Pierson have endorsed it. The principle of progression seems justified in theory, and is demanded in practice to obtain even proportionality.

(*b*) The general property tax—a tax levied alike upon all property, real and personal—embodies the most primitive idea of taxation. As the nations of Europe advanced beyond the ideas of securing revenue by predatory war, by the king's right to take any property because it was his own, by voluntary or forced loans, or by the grant of exclusive rights or privileges, they recognized that some principle of regularity and justice must be introduced in taxation; and they successively, almost without exception, adopted the general property tax. Probably in the early stages of a nation's development this may be as fair a tax as can be imposed. Property then consists almost entirely of real estate and tangible effects, which cannot elude the assessor's vigilance. But, as the nation progresses, an ever-increasing proportion of its wealth is represented by intangible property, which can and does elude the most stringent laws and the most active officials. A general

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

property tax then becomes practically a single tax on real estate, and more and more regressive; that is, in general, the larger the estate, the smaller in proportion the tax it pays. That New York is no exception to this rule will be shown hereafter. Nation after nation, recognizing the impossibility of doing justice in taxation by a general property tax, has abandoned the attempt to tax personalty directly, and is seeking to accomplish the purpose by other means,—particularly by an inheritance tax. The only civilized countries in the world to-day that still retain a direct tax on personal property are the United States, Switzerland, and a part of Australia.

Apart from every other consideration, a progressive inheritance tax is amply justified as a means of reaching proportionality in taxation. As a rule, the larger the estate, the larger the proportion of it invested in personalty, and the larger the proportion which escapes taxation. Laws can only be enacted to do justice in a great majority of cases. Human wisdom cannot devise a law which will do justice in every case. A reasonably progressive inheritance tax might give inequality of taxation in some cases; but in the great majority of cases it would simply reach a fair approximation of proportional taxation. The essentials of a system of taxation are conceded to be the collection of the necessary revenue for the state at the smallest possible expense consistent with the equal and fair distribution of the burden. Governor Hoffman, in a Message to the Legislature in 1871, said:—

> **"The interests of the people require a method of taxation at once equitable, effective, and free from unnecessary oppression; one which will yield the requisite revenue, while subjecting them as little as possible to inquisitorial vexation, and which shall be attended with the least expense for official service, and afford the fewest temptations to fraud, concealment, or evasion."**

It may be said of the inheritance tax in general that it has the great advantages which are, or should be, sought by governments in every tax system; to wit, difficulty of evasion, impossibility of shifting, and ease and cheapness of collection; and, in addition, as Prof. West says, "as to the time of payment, it is the most convenient of all direct taxes." Certainly the person who has died can be put to no inconvenience by it; and the person who is receiving a fortune for which he has not labored or sacrificed can afford to pay it. An inheritance tax of 10 per cent has been claimed by political economists to furnish an additional encouragement to industry and thrift, for the reason that the person knows that his estate is to be diminished by that amount; and the reduction is not large enough to cause discouragement.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A graduated inheritance tax, progressive according to degree of relationship, has for many years been a feature of the tax system of nearly every country in Europe. This system seems to have had its origin in Holland, and to have spread thence to almost the whole Western world. An inheritance tax, progressive as the estate increases, is to us a feature of more recent growth, although it was a form of Roman taxation. In modern times, this latter principle seems to have been first adopted practically and successfully in Switzerland; and it is now employed in taxation in nearly all the Swiss cantons. In 1892, Holland adopted a new tax system, a notable feature of it being progressive property and income taxes; and these were advocated and sustained by the government upon the "faculty" or "ability to pay" theory. In 1894, England adopted the progressive principle in her inheritance tax; the rate varying, according to the value of the estate, from 1 to 8 per cent. These rates were in addition to a tax varying from 1 to 10 per cent, according to the degree of relationship. The English tax, therefore, runs from 2 to 18 per cent.

If one were to select the two countries of the world least influenced by communistic or socialistic ideas, he would certainly select Holland and England; and, while the fact that they have not been affected by these "isms" is due mostly to the character of their people, their freedom from them is also due to the promptness with which they adopt principles of government which are demonstrated to be just and politic.

Nearly all the dependencies of England have adopted the progressive inheritance tax. In Victoria the rates are progressive as the estate increases, running from 1 to 10 per cent; in Queensland, the same; in New South Wales, 1 to 5 per cent; in New Zealand, 2½ to 10 per cent; in Tasmania, 2 to 3 per cent; in the Province of Ontario, 2½ to 10 per cent; in Nova Scotia, 2½ to 10 per cent.

The United States is practically the only English-speaking nation in the world that has not adopted the progressive principle. There is now pending in the *Corps Legislatif* in France, with probability of passage, a bill for a progressive inheritance tax varying from 1 to 10 per cent.

Nearly all these progressive-inheritance-tax acts have been adopted within the last ten years.

A quotation from Prof. Seligman's "Essays in Taxation" (p. 339) seems not inappropriate here:—

"After this survey it is needless to point out the lessons applicable to the United States. The economic conditions of the civilized world are everywhere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fast becoming the same; and upon the changes in economic condition depend the changes in financial systems. In old Europe, as well as in young Australia, the same tendency is unmistakable—the trend to greater justice in taxation. When four widely distant countries reform their systems almost simultaneously, and upon the same general lines, the inference is irresistible that the causes of the movement are of far more than mere local significance. To shut our eyes to this world-wide movement would be supreme folly: to profit by its lessons and to bring our own system into line with the demands of modern science and to modern conditions will be no less wise than it is inevitable."

(*c*) Every person who has dealt either practically or theoretically with taxation must have been impressed with the fact that men, honorable in all other dealings, and who would under no circumstances take a dollar which did not rightfully belong to them, will shirk, without scruple, the burden of taxation which the law has imposed upon them; and thus their generally less fortunate neighbors must pay more than their fair share. Because this practice is so common, it seems almost to have acquired moral sanction.

Let us consider how the idea of proportionality, which the opponents of a progressive inheritance tax so loudly approve, is in practice realized. It does not require argument to prove that nine out of ten men, worth from one to twenty thousand dollars, have their property in tangible form. It is in a home, a farm, a shop, or some other form easily reached by the assessor. On the contrary, that which is owned by a man worth more than a quarter of a million dollars, will be, in three out of four cases, in intangible form, so that the assessor never learns of its existence until after the owner's death. There has hardly been a report of a State financial or assessing officer in the United States in the past twenty-five years that has not discussed, in a tone almost of despair, the wholesale escape of personal property from taxation. Hundreds of legislative committees and commissions whose duty it was to revise tax laws have joined in this chorus. The same complaint comes from States that have adopted a listing system or other more stringent methods; and the difference in results in these States hardly seems to warrant the moral hazard involved.

I think it will be readily conceded that in personal property New York is proportionately the richest of all the States. And yet, in the percentage of its assessed personalty to its assessed realty, it is the lowest among the wealthier States. The assessed value of real estate in New York is $3,952,451,417, and of personal property, $539,863,305, or $12\frac{6}{10}$ per cent that of the realty. The following table shows that the same difference exists elsewhere, though not in so marked a degree.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State.	Real Property.	Personal.	Per cent.
New Jersey	$640,188,332	$134,210,000	17 4/10
Ohio	1,215,540,454	528,977,260	30
Illinois	687,510,306	143,800,000	17
Indiana	813,820,000	286,000,000	26
Massachusetts	1,964,834,106	577,614,889	22 7/10
Pennsylvania	2,471,000,000	647,000,000	20 5/10

Some interesting facts may be gathered from a comparison by counties of New York's table of valuations. The proportion which the personalty bears to the realty in the various counties ranges from six-tenths of 1 per cent in Richmond County, to 22½ per cent in New York. The counties which show the largest percentage of personalty in the rural districts are Washington County, with nearly 20 per cent, Livingston, with nearly 14 per cent, and Jefferson and Genesee, with 13 per cent. Kings County, containing the city of Brooklyn, has but 4⅓ per cent; Monroe County, with the city of Rochester, has but 5 6/10 per cent; Erie County, with the city of Buffalo, has but 6 4/10 per cent; Onondaga County, with the city of Syracuse, has but 6 7/10 per cent. The counties in the first group are largely devoted to farming. Does anyone for a moment suppose that these farming counties have a larger percentage of personal property than the counties in which are located the flourishing cities named ?

The amount of equalized personalty paying taxes to the State of New York in 1896 was $459,859,526; and, by the report of the Superintendent of the Banking Department, it appears that the capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the banks, trust companies, and safe-deposit companies of the State was $311,386,372. Under the law these institutions could not escape taxation. They are required to pay on the value of their capital stock; and that includes the surplus and undivided profits. There was then only $148,473,154 of personal property over and above the banking and trust-company capital which paid taxes in 1896. In 1857, Sanford E. Church, then Comptroller, felt called upon in his annual report to direct the attention of the Legislature to the way in which personal property was escaping taxation. He reported the amount of personalty then paying taxes to the State to be $319,897,155, of which $110,000,000 was banking capital, leaving $209,897,155 of other personal property then paying taxes; that is to say, in round numbers, there was $61,000,000 more of such personal property paying taxes in 1857 than in 1896. Yet everybody knows

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that personal property in the State of New York has increased enormously in the last forty years.

One hundred and seven estates were selected at random in the Comptroller's office, with the amount of appraised personal property found after death; and the amount of personal property, on which the decedent in each case was assessed the year before death, was ascertained. The estates were selected from various portions of the State. Of the one hundred and seven estates, thirty-four, ranging from $54,559 to $3,319,500, were assessed the year before decedent's death *absolutely nothing whatever.* The following table gives the figures in the remaining 73 cases:—

Amount of Appraised Personal Property after death.	Amount Assessed to Decedent year before death.	Amount of Appraised Personal Property after death.	Amount Assessed to Decedent year before death.
$3,544,343	$15,000	$247,358	$10,000
2,544,008	10,000	221,353	5,000
1,400,000	15,000	3,592,846	20,000
2,756,323	20,000	2,188,710	5,000
10,252,857	500,000	319,986	10,000
1,222,116	10,000	107,233	5,000
1,000,000	10,000	2,876,387	18,000
1,167,015	5,000	645,147	15,000
1,303,057	15,000	2,327,075	55,000
3,458,408	80,000	121,858	18,000
1,083,928	12,000	102,432	6,412
1,146,101	5,000	166,290	51,000
3,800,000	100,000	160,960	30,000
4,703,424	220,000	1,016,227	28,000
3,060,238	75,000	1,649,018	10,000
1,100,000	12,000	2,125,577	400,000
1,500,000	100,000	1,374,039	12,000
1,077,357	100,000	3,284,819	25,000
1,484,265	87,000	1,056,809	10,000
934,164	50,000	2,770,570	200,000
1,160,629	10,000	342,672	3,000
1,063,406	75,000	411,212	5,000
1,000,000	100,000	6,685,735	100,000
1,600,000	50,000	217,844	10,000
1,500,000	50,000	388,429	20,000
6,500,000	160,000	410,058	30,000
800,000	40,000	1,435,816	10,000
800,000	50,000	1,160,656	20,000
3,500,000	20,000	1,117,908	5,000
1,296,516	34,000	361,678	5,000
80,000,000	500,000	943,979	30,000
170,655	10,000	947,504	10,000
260,214	5,000	441,543	3,000
526,585	25,000	2,015,852	5,000
312,894	35,000	677,644	3,000
263,266	20,000	306,133	2,000
539,552	10,000		

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No names have been given in this table, because these cases are neither singular nor exceptional. The decedents were not sinners above all the men that dwelt in New York; but they simply did that which everybody in the community was doing. These one hundred and seven estates disclosed personalty to the appraiser aggregating $215,132,366; and yet the decedents, the year before their respective deaths, had been assessed in the aggregate on personal property to the amount of $3,819,412,—or on $1\frac{77}{100}$ per cent of the actual value of the property. This table is both interesting and instructive. It shows not only wholesale evasion of taxation, but ridiculous disparity in assessing even the $1\frac{77}{100}$ per cent. It shows also that thirty-four, or almost one-third, of the estates absolutely escaped the tax, and that, in the estates which did pay, the tax varied from two-tenths of 1 per cent to nearly 19 per cent. All these facts furnish cumulative evidence that, in its practical operation, the present system is defective, unfair, unjust, and monstrous; and the inquiry is pertinent, "Why longer continue it?" Why not, instead, levy an inheritance tax which shall be approximately a payment of back taxes evaded or not imposed during life—a tax paid in a lump sum once in a lifetime? The estates above given were impartially selected without previous knowledge of the amounts at which they had been assessed; and I believe they may be taken as fairly indicative of the proportion of personal property in New York which is actually paying taxes.

It would seem, therefore, that it would be a conservative estimate to say that the $148,473,154 of non-banking personalty that paid tax, as shown above, bore the same relation to the whole amount of personalty in the State that the $1\frac{77}{100}$ of the above estates which paid tax before death bore to the appraised value after death. It is conservative because there was undoubtedly included in the $1\frac{77}{100}$ per cent a considerable amount of bank stock.

If this were so, then 100 per cent, or the whole non-banking personalty of the State, would be $8,388,313,779. Add to this the banking capital and we have, as the total personalty of the State, $8,699,700,151.

Nearly all this enormous amount of personal property is subject to tax in the same manner as real estate. There are a few exceptions; the most important being government bonds and the refunding bonds of our cities. The total bonded debt of the United States is $1,598,758,100. Admitting for the moment that one-fourth of these bonds are held in the State of New York (and everyone will concede this to be an over-estimate), and we have $399,689,525 of government bonds ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

empt from taxation. The amount of municipal indebtedness cannot exceed 10 per centum of assessed valuation, except for water purposes. The water debt will not exceed 5 per cent of the assessed valuation of our cities. The assessed valuation of the real estate of our cities is, in round numbers, $2,875,000,000. Fifteen per centum of this amount is $431,250,000,—which certainly would form the limit of the bonded debt of our cities. New York City's total bonded debt is $188,153,-107; and of this, $34,936,900, or a little over 18½ per cent, is refunding bonds. The amount of refunding bonds would thus not exceed $80,000,000 in the whole State. Deducting these two amounts from our estimate of personal property for the State, and there is left $8,220,-010,625 of personalty taxable under the law. But we are told that much of this property, if taxed, would be unjustly taxed, because it is in the form of mortgages on real estate already subjected to its full burden of taxation, or in stocks of corporations the property of which is largely real estate, and that taxation of personalty in such cases amounts to double taxation. A careful calculation of the amount of real estate assessed to corporations in the city of Buffalo disclosed $41,-095,030: the total assessed value of the city's real estate is $225,485,-795. Thus 18⅕ per cent of the real estate is assessed to corporations. In that city unusually large tracts of land are held by land companies, and the railroad holdings of real estate are very large; so that the percentage of corporate holdings of real estate in the city of Buffalo would surely be as great as in the State at large. The equalized assessed value of the real estate of the State of New York for the year 1896 was $3,908,853,377; and 18⅕ per cent of that amount, or $711,-411,314, may be taken as fairly representing the value of the corporate real estate of the State. The total of the mortgages on New York's real estate, as reported in the last United States census, was $2,276,-932,371. Deducting these two amounts, there is still left $5,231,666,-940 of untaxed personal property (or considerably more than the entire assessed value of all New York's real and personal property) which, according to every principle of justice and fairness, ought to be taxed. The burden of taxation on real estate is, therefore, at least double what it should be; and a large portion of this burden falls upon our farmers, our mechanics who own their own homes, and our men of moderate means. Is this right, or is it good public policy?

There can be no doubt that private ownership of property is one of the great civilizing forces; that the man who has acquired a home is made thereby a better citizen; that the government is more necessary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to him; and that he is more fixed in his loyalty, more reliable in his principles, and less liable to be a communist or an anarchist. For this reason, if for no other, men should be encouraged to acquire property, and not punished for it by being made to pay double the amount of taxes which proportionately belongs to them to pay. Roscher, in his interesting work on political economy, speaking of the tendency to a conflict between the rich and the poor, says in substance, that such a conflict would be inevitable were it not for that great class who are neither rich nor poor, and who shade up gradually in their property holdings from the poor to the rich, and who stand as a wall of defence for the rich against the intensity of life and desperation of the poor. A moment's reflection will convince anyone that this is so. Should this great class be punished for the protection they thus afford the rich? It is upon them, as I have already said, that a greater burden of taxation falls than, according to any proportional, equitable, or politic principle, they should be compelled to bear.

In every exciting political contest, such as that of 1896, the great question which agitates the mind of a man interested in the result is, "How will the farmer and the industrious and intelligent mechanic act?" There was no doubt in 1896 where the rich man would stand; but there was grave doubt as to what the farmer and mechanic might conclude to do, because everyone realized that the condition of these men was particularly hard. Unless some effort is made to lighten their burden, their attitude may become still more doubtful. The comparatively few dollars of tax which the farmer or the mechanic has to pay seem such a paltry sum to the multi-millionaire that he cannot realize how hard their acquisition has been, nor that necessaries or comforts of life have been sacrificed in saving them. But such is the case; and no one need congratulate himself that these men do not fully realize that they are paying more than they should pay.

As to the cry that property would be driven from the State by the progressive inheritance tax, I may say that this cry is not new. It was raised in the State of New York when the proposition was made to levy a general property tax in 1842; it again arose in 1880, when the proposition was made to tax corporations; and it was heard yet more loudly in 1885 when the act to tax inheritances was passed. Yet New York has increased her corporations and wealth at least proportionately with other States since these acts became law. Consideration certainly is due to the question of what is just and right. No nation or State can lose, in the long run, by pursuing a course of justice.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Charles Sumner said that "Nothing is settled which is not right"; and on this principle our system of taxation cannot be regarded as settled. I, for one, do not believe that any patriotic man of wealth will expatriate himself, or remove from the State whose protection and opportunities enabled him or his ancestor to accumulate a great fortune, simply because his estate will be called upon to pay its fair proportion of taxes when it passes to heirs who had little or nothing to do with its accumulation.

The average rate of State tax in New York for the past thirty-two years has been not far from 4.2223 mills on the dollar per annum. Multiply this by thirty-two, the average of human life, and you have a tax of $13\frac{5}{10}$ per cent, which the farmer and the owner of real estate have paid to the State of New York in that period. What hardship is it to the man whose personal property has escaped taxation all through his life, or to his heir, that his estate must pay a tax of 10 per cent after his death? As has been shown, the removal of personal property from the State would affect very little the amount of annual tax which is now collected. So little of it is taxed that practically it would be almost as well, and in point of honesty far better, to abandon the attempt to tax it in a general tax. There is abundant testimony that such a tax has not tended to drive capital away from countries in which it has been adopted; and in some of these—notably the Swiss cantons and some of the British colonies—the conditions are very similar to our own. A person might move from one canton or colony to another without leaving his country in the same way that he might move from one State to another and still be a citizen of the United States; but no perceptible transfer of estates is reported.

The inheritance tax has been held by the courts to be not a tax on property, but rather a tax on its devolution; but, while I do not propose to discuss the constitutionality of progression in such a tax, I believe a fair interpretation of the decisions shows that it is not a violation of the Constitution of the United States. The language of the United States Supreme Court, in Kentucky Railroad Tax cases, 115 U. S., 321, seems strongly in point:—

"A State law for the valuation of property and the assessment of taxes thereon, which provides for the classification of property subject to its provisions into different classes; which makes for one class one set of provisions as to modes and methods of ascertaining the value, and as to the right of appeal, and different provisions for another class of those subjects, *but which provides for the impartial application of the same means and method to all constituents of each*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class, so that the law shall operate equally and uniformly on all persons in similar circumstances, denies to no person affected by it 'equal protection of the laws' within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution."

I think I have answered Mr. Belmont's suggestion, in the March FORUM, that I had forgotten the teachings of our forefathers in my proposal for progressive inheritance taxation. I have said that, in the earlier stages of a nation's development, a general property tax is probably as fair as any, because property is then nearly all in tangible form. So I approve of the wisdom of our fathers in adopting that system of taxation at the time of its adoption. But, in the century that has intervened, economic conditions have undergone marvellous changes; and no one who has examined the question at all can for a moment claim that the general property tax is now a proportional tax. It is highly regressive, favoring the rich, and is as repugnant to a just recognition of our present economic conditions, as is slavery (which our forefathers also established) to our present moral convictions.

JAMES A. ROBERTS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAS THE SENATE DEGENERATED?

WHEN George F. Hoar first took his seat in the United States Senate, bringing up from the House the fruits of eight years' experience as a Representative and that serious interest in the public business that for more than a quarter of a century has made him a conspicuous figure at Washington, he gazed about him upon a body of men of whom nearly one-half were already distinguished for their ability and influence, while several of them were destined to still higher honors and larger responsibilities in the service of the nation.

It was on March 5, 1877, at the first meeting of the Senate of the Forty-fifth Congress, called in extraordinary session by President Hayes for the confirmation of executive appointments. There sat Anthony, whom Rhode Island obeyed and the country respected, and Allison, then as now one of the most just-minded men of his party. Thomas F. Bayard was there, a man of gifts and true democracy, whom a Democratic President was to call to his aid as Secretary of State and, later on, to the first ambassadorship. The lamented Beck sat there for Kentucky, and Newton Booth, the finest mind ever placed at the service of the State of California in either House of Congress. Mr. Blaine, whom Mr. Hoar did not like, and Roscoe Conkling, who did not like Mr. Hoar, were the two most powerful partisan chieftains in the Chamber. David Davis, a very able man, was equally noted for his independence of party. Edmunds and Thurman, good friends in private, fair foes in politics, expounded the Constitution with a breadth and soundness of learning unknown to the Senate since they retired leaving no successors. Windom, Lamar, Howe, and Kirkwood were later on to be called to Cabinet places, and Stanley Matthews to the bench of the Supreme Court. Other men of real strength were Oliver P. Morton, the eloquent Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, Justin S. Morrill, Angus Cameron, Hannibal Hamlin, Francis Kernan, and Plumb, of Kansas.

Here were twenty-two men every one of whom was a moving force in the work of the Senate. Every one made his influence felt in committee or in debate, and imposed himself upon the public attention as a distinct and energetic personality.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As the eye of Mr. Hoar roams about the Chamber in quest of the notables who take part in the proceedings of the more numerous Senate of to-day, it rests upon no figure so great and striking as the greatest of these, nor marks out more than a score who are in any way distinguishable from the mute herd whose senatorial activities are limited to the hunting of patronage and the care of private pension bills. As I study the list, I see no names but these that, under the most liberal interpretation of the term, could be called distinguished: Morgan, Allison, Hale, Frye, Gorman, Hawley, Lodge, Hoar, C. K. Davis, Chandler, Platt, Hanna, Foraker, Quay, Aldrich, Elkins, Tillman, Mills, Gray, and Stewart—twenty in all.

There are no great names here. What Senator among them can pretend to a tithe of Blaine's power to stir the hearts of the people? How unpersuasive in leadership would the ablest of these men be if he should set his heart on the Presidency and sally forth among the masses to build up a following. There would be no inspiration in the appeal of any of them. They would be impotent, ineffective, absurd. What constitutional lawyer is there here to match Edmunds or Thurman? Platt may be the equal of Conkling in political leadership, and Quay may offset Oliver P. Morton as the boss of a State: but the moral weight of Bayard, Beck, Booth, David Davis, Windom, and Lamar, or of Edmunds and Thurman already mentioned, has no counterpoise; and the Senate of to-day must kick the beam.

Let us broaden the comparison. If, as Mr. Hoar so strenuously contends in THE FORUM for April, the Senate has not degenerated, it must now be of such high distinction that we may, without fear, set it over against the Senate of a time, now remote, when the roll bore names so illustrious that our children know what they stand for in the nation's history. I trust Senator Hoar will not accuse me of taking an unfair advantage if I go back half a century to a decade when the slavery question roused the patriotism and kindled the passions of the country, and centred its attention upon the giants contending in the Senate Chamber for the settlement of sectional differences that only later and sterner disputants could adjust. I will select the most conspicuous names that stood on the rolls of the Senate during the ten years from 1843 to 1853, the Twenty-eighth to the Thirty-second Congress, inclusive, and, for comparison and contrast, the most shining names among those elected to the Senate from 1889 to the term ending with 1899,—the ten years including the Fifty-first Congress and the Fifty-fifth.

From 1843 to 1853: Senators Thomas H. Benton, James Buchanan,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rufus Choate, Daniel S. Dickinson, John A. Dix, Levi Woodbury, Silas Wright, John C. Calhoun, Lewis Cass, Simon Cameron, Sam Houston, Reverdy Johnson, Daniel Webster, Thomas Corwin, Jefferson Davis, Stephen A. Douglas, R. M. T. Hunter, Salmon P. Chase, Henry Clay, Thomas Ewing, John C. Frémont, John P. Hale, Robert C. Winthrop, William H. Seward, James A. Bayard, Solomon Foot, Henry S. Foote, Hamilton Fish, Hannibal Hamlin, Charles Sumner, and Benjamin F. Wade.

From 1889 to 1899: Senators Morgan, Allison, Hale, Frye, Gorman, Lodge, Hoar, Sherman, Foraker, Hanna, Aldrich, Justin S. Morrill, Pugh, Teller, Palmer, Voorhees, Vest, W. E. Chandler, David B. Hill, Brice, Quay, Don Cameron, Mills, Elkins, Hawley, Cullom, Peffer, Vilas, Evarts, Stewart, Vance, and John P. Jones.

I do not expect Senator Hoar to throw up his brief after an inspection of these lists. No doubt he does intellectual homage to Webster and Clay and Calhoun and the men who were grouped about them in the 'forties. He reveres them as he reveres the second aorist, something majestic and pervading, but shadowy and far off; while the Senators with whom he now every day sits or strives look big to him and dwarf the figures farther down the gallery. Besides, I am afraid the Massachusetts Senator is not imbued with the scientific spirit. To a candid world, the comparison I have made will be convincing, I think. In the laboratory of social and political science, these exhibits will suffice for a demonstration that the Senate *has* degenerated. To employ the lingo of the neo-scientific charlatanry, the stigmata of degeneration are visible upon the body and in the behavior of the Senate. I prefer the reasoning and the terminology of the older and sounder men of science, the Darwins and Spencers and Tyndalls who have traced for us the laws of change in the organic world. Accordingly, I should say with them that the Senate has undergone a variation from the type. The upper House of Congress is an organic structure: it is one of the organs of the Republic. Its present form and functions are the result of evolution, up or down, from the original type. If we would measure the possible changes it has undergone, we must examine the early structure in comparison with the structure of to-day, and note the divergences.

The Senator admits that "the Senate must be justified by the behavior of the men who compose it now, and not by the behavior of the men who composed it in the time of our fathers"; and he finds it "interesting to examine anew the original constitution of the Senate, and to see how far it has met the expectations of the Fathers."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We know what were the "expectations of the Fathers." In the Federal Convention of 1787, Edmund Randolph, of Virginia, in giving his views as to the constitution of the "second branch" of the Congress, declared that "it ought to be made much smaller than the first, so small as to be exempt from the passionate proceedings to which numerous assemblies are liable"; since, in tracing to their origin the evils under which the Federation labored, "every man found it to be in the turbulence and follies of democracy," and a good Senate seemed most likely to answer the purpose of a check against "this tendency of our governments." No part of the creative work of the Convention was the subject of more anxious consideration, or was more carefully matured. In order to insure a measure of experience and soberness of judgment, no person was to be elected Senator until he had attained the age of thirty years. As the Senate was, with the President, to exercise control over foreign relations, it was prescribed that Senators must have been for nine years citizens of the United States; while a citizenship of five years, with a minimum age limit of twenty-five, sufficed to qualify for election to the House. In those days the possession of wealth brought no reproach upon any man; and General Pinckney seriously proposed, and Dr. Franklin seconded the motion, that Senators should have no salary, since that body ought to be composed of men of wealth and position. The authors of the "Federalist" essays, writing in support of the Constitution and with the purpose of procuring its adoption by the States, dwelt with expository fulness and visible pride upon the constitution of the Senate. Historic precedents of Greece and Rome and all nations that had set up a second house of legislature were marshalled to show that the Convention had profited by the wisdom of the ancients, and had improved upon it. Hamilton wrote:—

"Through the medium of the State Legislatures—which are select bodies of men, and which are to appoint the members of the national Senate—there is reason to expect that this branch will generally be composed with peculiar care and judgment; that these circumstances promise greater knowledge and more extensive information in the national councils, and that they will be less apt to be tainted by the spirit of faction and more out of reach of those occasional ill humors or temporary prejudices and propensities which, in smaller societies, frequently contaminate the public councils."

What a picture of the Senate as it appeared in February last when Senator Cameron was pressing a resolution that would have brought on a war with Spain, and Senator Morgan was stamping on the Arbitration Treaty to relieve a spirit overburdened with hatred of Grover Cleveland and Richard Olney! Was Jay any nearer the mark when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he prophesied that in the choice of Senators the votes of the State Legislatures "will be directed to those men only who have become the most distinguished by their virtue and in whom the people have perceived just grounds for confidence."

Was it in this spirit that the New York Legislature chose Edward Murphy, Jr.? Was it after a prayerful search for men of virtue and ability among the available male population of the State that the choice of the Albany Solons fell on Mr. Platt? And did the Pennsylvania legislators send Quay to the Senate because they discovered in him "just grounds for confidence"?

Here is the original type of the Senate as clearly present in the minds and pictured forth in the language of the framers of the Constitution; and along with that delineation I have presented some individual deviations that show how it has failed to meet "the expectations of the Fathers." It is not in individual variations, however, that we can best trace degenerative changes, but by a study from time to time of the behavior of the entire body when engaged in the performance of its functions.

The Senate is now fighting for its place, and angrily protesting that it ought to have the respect and confidence of the country.

In the old days, Presidents were fain to consult at every step the wise, experienced, and eminent men of the upper branch. The people reverenced them and, by their greatness, proudly affirmed the greatness of America.

In comparison with the heroic age when Webster and Calhoun and Clay and Douglas and the fiery tribunes of the "peculiar institution" compelled the attention of every intelligent man and woman in the country and quite overshadowed the Executive by their dominating contentions, the Senate nowadays is a parvenu family, struggling for social place and recognition, sure neither of its clothes nor its manners, ignored by the great, rebuffed at every door, and ridiculed by the whole community. You can find fairly intelligent men who would be unable to name more than two or three Senators of the United States. It could not have been so in Webster's time.

> "We are selfish men.
> Oh! raise us up, return to us again;
> And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power."

Not long ago Senator Hoar personally listened to most conclusive evidence of the degeneracy of the Senate. During the discussion of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the resolutions providing for the recognition of the sovereignty of the "Republic of Cuba," when Senators were mad with jingo frenzy and sober-minded people were apprehensive, Secretary Olney contemptuously remarked that the recognition of sovereignty was none of the Senate's business. It was exclusively a Presidential prerogative; and he very plainly intimated that the President would pay no attention to any resolutions relating to Cuban recognition which the Senate might be pleased to pass. Immediately there was a great ruffling of feathers among the Senators. The declaration of the Secretary of State was denounced as an affront, an outrage upon the Senate's dignity, and an attempt to abridge its constitutional powers. I do not know why Secretary Olney chose the unusual medium of a newspaper interview for this important utterance; but it is probable that there was at the moment no official channel through which he could communicate to the jingo Senators the salutary and needed information. The form and manner, no less than the matter, of the communication roused his and the President's enemies in the Senate to a pitch of rage, in which they freely exhibited themselves in full possession of the passions and the factious spirit from which the Fathers fondly imagined they would be free.

This very question of the respective powers of the legislative and the executive departments in the recognition of the sovereignty of newly created governments came up in the first Administration of Monroe, and again, in 1836, in the Administration of Jackson. Clay, while still a member of the House, in 1817, began to urge a prompt recognition of the revolted colonies of Spain in South America; and nearly twenty years later it fell to him, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to press for a speedy greeting to the Republic of Texas as a nation. In each case the Executive took its time: but in the courteous exchange of views each branch behaved with the dignity of conscious power; and in the case of the Spanish Republics it was not the Senate at all, but the House, that attempted to force the President's hand. President Tyler's plans for the annexation of Texas were checked by the Senate, which defeated his treaty. He could not control so strong a body: he could do nothing without it. He canvassed the strength of the opposition at every step, and sought to win over its members. Finally he was obliged to abandon the treaty, which required a two-thirds vote, and to ask that Texas be admitted by a joint resolution, for which a majority was sufficient. The weakness of Tyler, and the power of the Senators, both those who were for and those who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were against annexation, were apparent throughout the contest. Polk could despatch Gen. Taylor to the Rio Grande, with instructions that meant war; but the moment Mexico prepared to accept the challenge he hastened to put the responsibility on Congress. To be sure, the Constitution required him to invoke the help of Congress if war was to be declared; but the support of Congress was necessary to make his war policy acceptable to the people. "Polk's war," they called it; but he was fortified behind the Senate's vote of 40 to 2 for money and troops. Both these Presidents intrigued and manœuvred to win the coöperation of a body that was strong enough to have destroyed them, had they been rash enough to defy it. They were wise; and they consulted the Senate, as the Executive will always do when the Senate is also wise.

When Seward, annoyed by House resolutions declaring that the United States could not longer tolerate the presence of the French troops of Napoleon III in Mexico, wrote to Minister Dayton in Paris that "the question of recognition of foreign revolutionary or reactionary governments is one exclusively for the Executive and cannot be determined internationally by congressional action," the Senate did not shriek out that President Lincoln was a usurper and Seward his willing tool. On the contrary, Charles Sumner, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, rendered valuable assistance in carrying out the policy of the Secretary of State by discreetly pocketing every resolution about Mexico that was referred to his committee. Both the President and the Senate being inspired by the highest patriotic purposes, relations of confidence and coöperation naturally existed between them, by which the national welfare was promoted.

It has thus far been shown that the Senate has now no party leaders or constitutional expounders of such power as those whom Senator Hoar found in that Chamber when he entered it twenty years ago; that while some of the greatest names that have adorned the pages of American history were upon the roll of the Senate half a century ago, there is now no Senator, and in the last decade there has been none, who has impressed the world by his abilities or made the age illustrious by his achievements; that the Executive, instead of seeking the aid and counsel of the Senate, as was the earlier custom, is obliged to rebuke it for its officious and offensive meddling, and must resort to extraordinary means to thwart its mischievous intentions; that, in place of spontaneous tributes to its greatness, it constantly receives popular testimonials of want of confidence and respect, which provoke its members

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to undignified exhibitions of resentment; and that, by its obstructive and fractious behavior, the Senate has become a body totally unlike the type planned and created by the Fathers. These changes constitute degeneracy. The organism has undergone a marked modification of form and function.

But it is not alone by obstinate ill-doing that the Senate has forfeited the public respect. In what it refuses to do, or does grudgingly under the lash of compulsion, it is unbearably exasperating. The mulish stubbornness with which it has resisted the will of the people in respect to the Treaty of Arbitration is a flagrant example of degenerate practices. That treaty was conceived in the spirit of higher civilization, of advancing humanity. It was of that indisputable expediency that is an inherent quality of truth and honesty and justice. No right-minded man sufficiently advanced to have laid aside skins, and discarded the stone hatchet and the club, could have refrained from acclaiming the principle of arbitration as a happy means of escaping the barbarism of war. The instrument had been perfected by the diligent labors of men incomparably abler and broader than any that now sit in the Senate. It was such a pact as an enlightened branch of the treaty-making power would have ratified after a delay sufficient only to allow its chief statesmen to express worthily their pleasure at joining in a work of such beneficence.

Yet, from the moment it received the Treaty from the hands of the President, the United States Senate has railed at it and rent it savagely, as though it were a league with death. Senators of twenty years' service have shown themselves not ashamed to plead the general issue against it; openly avowing a hostility to arbitration and to England, which it was their judgment the country also ought to feel. Others have opposed ratification as a means of revenge upon Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Olney, and have been unable to conceal their detestable motive. Still others, and I grieve to say that Senator Hoar is one of these, have put upon the Treaty unsightly and perverting patches of amendment that well-nigh extinguish its usefulness, and endanger its acceptance by England.

These are the characteristic procedures of a degenerate Legislature. It is impossible that in any Senate where sat a Webster or a Sumner the meaner and uncivilized half would, in so grave a business, achieve an almost unresisted triumph. The savages would slink away before the majesty of their countenances, or be persuaded by the eloquence of their lips.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I suppose that when Senator Hoar invented the new social stratum which he describes as the American "populace"—a rank neologism as he employs the term—he had in mind the thousand or more bishops, clergymen, college presidents and professors, philanthropists, authors, jurists, and prominent men of affairs, who recently sent to the Senate their fervent prayer that the Arbitration Treaty might soon be ratified. This "cultivated and lettered populace" of ours is described with circumstance in Senator Hoar's FORUM article:—

> "Our populace does not come from the poor or ignorant classes. It is made of very different material. It has white and clean hands. It parts its hair in the middle. . . . . It prates and chatters a good deal about the sentiment of honor and political purity; but it is never found doing any strenuous work on the honest side when these things are in peril. . . . . It contributes to public discussions nothing but sneers, or expressions of contempt or pessimistic despair. It is found quite as commonly on the wicked side as on the honest side."

On the heads of these learned blatherskites the Senator pours out his wrath with sacerdotal austerity as though he were the high-priest pronouncing upon the people the penalties of their impious conduct. Is not the Senate, by constitutional designation and the mode of its election, set far above the people to protect them from their own gusts of passion? May it be importuned by petition like a dirty little board of aldermen? Must it listen to lectures as to its duty from the turbulent milksops of the colleges and the pulpits? Shall its precious freedom of debate be abridged or its sage deliberations be hurried by the irresponsible clamor of bishops and judges? Every feeling heart will sympathize with the evident sense of injury under which the Massachusetts Senator declaims his arraignment of the white-handed and lettered mob. His position is deplorable, his task difficult. Nothing is so injurious to a man's dignity as to have it questioned. And when the dignity with which the Senators solemnly invest themselves is stripped off with irreverence and jeers they must be pardoned if they show some irritation.

Upon two other occasions within the last four years the Senate has stood out in stiff-necked opposition to the sentiment of the country. If its attitude toward the Arbitration Treaty was barbarous, its prolonged haggling over the repeal of the Sherman Silver-Purchase Act in 1893 was wicked. The nation was in the throes of a financial convulsion. Upon the urgent recommendation of the President, the House of Representatives passed a repeal bill promptly. The Senate held it under pointless and inane debate for two months, while con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fidence fled the country and business went to rack and ruin. Even when this immeasurable harm had been done, it was only in obedience to extraordinary outside pressure and by a narrow majority that the Senate finally assented to the repeal. In its treatment of the Wilson Tariff Bill of 1894 it showed the same unreasoning disregard of the public wish and interest. Considerations of low tariff and high tariff do not enter at all into my condemnation of its behavior. The Bill was held in the Senate not for amendment along the lines of either policy, but for individual and disconnected assaults upon its schedules of such strange persistency that men grew suspicious, and at length became convinced that no honorable motive could actuate certain of the Senators in their highwayman-like attitude toward it.

If a comparative study of the personnel and efficiency of the Senate at different periods and the record of its malfeasance and nonfeasance afford insufficient proof of its degeneracy, some light may be thrown upon the problem by observation of its manners. Here Senator Hoar feels himself upon solid ground. "Talk about the degeneracy of the Senate!" he exclaims, to a man who is writing at the very desk beside which Charles Sumner was struck down by the ruffian's bludgeon, who remembers that Foote—the same Foote who drew a pistol upon the indispensable Benton—in debate warned Hale that he would be hanged upon the tallest tree in the forest, if he should visit Mississippi, and who recalls the days when honorable but convivial Senators came into the Chamber "with whiskey-soaked brains."

Alas! men had their failings even in the heroic age. It is true that the passions of the Southern Senators were sometimes violent and ungovernable. It is true that Brooks was a coward and a ruffian; and it is true that at various periods in the history of this nation United States Senators have been too much given to the indefensible practice of alcoholic stimulation. We hope Senator Hoar is right in his assumption that no Senator now ever drinks more than is good for him. But, deplorable as were the exhibitions to which he refers, they were perfectly compatible with the concentration in the Senate Chamber of more brains and force and greatness and general efficiency than can be assembled there from forty-five States in these days of decorum and degeneracy. The politest little man in the world may be a less interesting example of a nation's virility than the swaggering fellow who can "clean out" a caucus. *Tom Jones* was a sad dog and got into no end of scrapes; but we can put up with his frank irregularities better than with the meaner vices of the sanctimonious *Blifil*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Daniel Webster, in that seventh of March speech in which he made the "grand renunciation" of his former views against the extension of slavery, gave more convincing proof of the greatness of the Senate than a dozen statesmen of the present senatorial calibre could do by years of perfectly consistent and irreproachable public conduct. The prostrate trunk of some centennial oak speaks more eloquently of the majesty of the forest than the scrubby exuberance of the living underbrush. Webster's fall awakened echoes that have not yet died away from our historical discussions. Of the present Senate, the perversities of one day are forgotten the next.

> "All else is gone; from those great eyes
> The soul has fled;
> When faith is lost, when honor dies,
> The man is dead."

No muse is stirred to such a glow of indignation by our modern Ichabods. We impale them with a paragraph, and let them squirm while we turn to weightier things.

To sum it up,—the Senate lacks moral authority and holds no leadership of opinion. Once it had both.

Senator Hoar, admitting some of the defects in the body he so skilfully defends, casts about rather helplessly and hopelessly for a remedy. It is not to be found in a change of the rules or in the manner of electing Senators. The evil lies deeper,—in the social conditions and tendencies of the time. The Senate was once the goal of every bright young man's aspirations. It no longer attracts them; and public life in all its stations has lost much of its old allurement. For one thing, the great questions that stirred the popular heart and roused those emotional fervors so dear and so necessary to the platform orator have mostly been settled by the growth of the country. During the slavery agitation strong men entered public life as devout young men enter the ministry,—in obedience to an inward call. But, with our tremendous industrial development, invocations more numerous and compelling come from other directions. To the young man casting about for the choice of a calling in life, the rewards which brains and ability can command in business or the professions seem far more generous and substantial than any degree of public fame to be won in discussing the sordid questions of tariff and free coinage. Great lawyers no longer go to the Senate. They cannot afford to give up corporation practice.

If Webster were alive to-day he would be neither in the Senate nor in debt.

C. R. MILLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IGNOMINY OF EUROPE.

"To one small people, covering in its original seat no more than a hand's-breadth of territory, it was given to create the principle of Progress, of movement onwards and not backwards or downwards, of destruction tending to construction. That people was the Greek. Except the blind forces of Nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin. A ferment spreading from that source has vitalized all the progressive races of mankind, penetrating from one to another, and producing results accordant with its hidden and latent genius, and results of course often far greater than any exhibited in Greece itself."—SIR HENRY SUMNER MAINE, "Village Communities," p. 238.

THE Cretan insurrection and the part which Greece is playing in it are generally so little understood in their true bearing and significance that it is easy for the "Powers of Europe"—now banded together against both Greece and Crete—and their agents, paid and unpaid, to delude the general public with meaningless phrases and misleading pretences, and thus to stifle that natural sympathy which all rightly constituted men feel for heroism and a long-sustained struggle for freedom. Under these circumstances, it does not seem inopportune that one who has devoted much study to the history of Greece, ancient and modern, who has spent considerable time, at different dates, in Greece, has travelled over the length and breadth of it on foot, and who has done his best to make himself acquainted with the character, aspirations, and difficulties of the Greek people should endeavor to make a brief statement of the sober facts of the case. With a view to this, we must cast a rapid glance at the history of Greece from the day of her greatness onward.

In the fifth century B.C., "plucky little Greece," having developed, through right living, a consciousness of inner freedom, was able, by a series of heroisms to which the story of the nations affords no parallel, to hurl back the huge billows of Oriental despotism that threatened to engulf her, found free institutions, and lay the basis of political and individual liberty. This achievement was hardly completed when the man was born who discovered the formula of rational liberty and dignity, brought it into consciousness, and thus made a permanent return to despotism forever impossible. This was Socrates, who placed the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

source of moral authority in the individual soul, recognized as an embodiment of universal reason. From the death of Socrates Greece pursued a downward course. Through internal dissensions, and the consequent victories of Macedonia, she lost her political liberty; while her philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, pretending to expound Socrates, produced theories which threw men back once more into the arms of external authority. The despotism of Macedonia, which had spread a somewhat degraded, Platonized form of Greek civilization over the whole Eastern world, thereby contributed to degrade that civilization still further, by introducing into it sensual and irrational elements. The process begun by Macedonia was continued by Rome. Under her, especially after the removal of the seat of power to Constantinople, the Greeks were imperialized,—which means that they were reduced to slavery. Finding this intolerable and yet unavoidable, they sought refuge in the dreamy other-world opened up to them by certain corrupt, fantastic, and mystic forms of Christianity, and so lost all hold upon the life of this world. The result was, as always, fanaticism, weakness, and barbarism. There are few sadder chapters in human history than that which describes the gradual, certain, thousand-year-long decay of the Greek Empire. At last the "Sick Man's" hour came. In 1453, the mummified carcass of the Greek nation was ground to powder by the unspeakable Turk, and flung to the winds of heaven. From that time forward the Greeks were homeless vagabonds.

But, notwithstanding the long and slow corruption of the Greek Empire, the spirit of liberty and culture inherent in it never entirely died out. There never was a time when a faithful "remnant" of the old Hellenism did not exist. Under the Turk, this spirit, so long held in sleep by the opiates of decay, returned to consciousness and began to look about. Those in whom it awoke, finding no place amid the coarse barbarism of the Turks, betook themselves to the deserts and the mountains, and lived the life of freebooters or, as they were called, "Klephts."

> "In the forest, the glen, and the wild lonely darkness,
> Where never the sword of the tyrant can come"[1]

they lived a life of freedom and excitement, defying the Turk, so that the term "Klepht" came to be a title of honor. This lasted for more than three hundred years, during which the Turk sank more and more into sluggish abasement, and the Greek rose in courage and sense of

[1] So begins one of the Klephtic ballads, still dear to the heart of the Greeks.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

freedom. Aware of this, the Turks seized Greek boys and trained them as soldiers. Such is the origin of the Janissaries. When we study the life and history of the Klephts, we may fairly say that Greece was never conquered. Her people, for a time overpowered by force, only waited for the moment when, made strong by heroic discipline, they should be able to claim their own. And that moment at last came. In the early decades of this century, when the teaching of the wilds had restored the race of Marathon, they suddenly emerged from the darkness and burst like a thunder-cloud upon their oppressors. After a heroic struggle of ten years, in which deeds were done worthy to rank beside the best of old, and with the sympathy of Christian Europe,—not yet dead to all sense of nobility and manliness,—a portion of them, the inhabitants of Greece proper, were able to escape from Turkish brutality and declare themselves free. The people that invented liberty had once more a local habitation and a name.

But alas! the Greeks, having gained their freedom, knew not what to do with it. In their long ages of Klephtic rebellion against accursed slavery, they had developed an individualism that made harmonious coöperation almost impossible. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? Moreover, their country, once the garden of the world, had, under Turkish misrule, become a desert, treeless and houseless. Poor, homeless, suffering from over three hundred years of proximity to the Turks, the Greeks began their political life. Surely no people ever started with greater odds against them. They had, in fact, nothing but themselves, their high hopes,—sometimes romantic enough,—hopes nourished by Klephtic ballads, and the memories, never lost, of the glorious days of yore. But, in spite of poverty, misery, and dissension, they struggled bravely on. Europe looked on and applauded; and some of its peoples even so far forgot their caution as to lend them money at exorbitant interest, the first instalment of which was deducted from the principal before it was paid over. Nay, more: Those countries which had helped Greece to vindicate her liberty felt so vain of their achievement, and so anxious that their coöperation should find due and lasting recognition, that they insisted upon treating her as a baby, and giving her a nurse in the person of a pompous Bavarian prince. This wooden figure-head, after wasting the nation's borrowed money in building himself a hideous barn of a marble palace, and drilling a useless army in fustanella and fez, was finally expelled by the outraged people in 1862. But, though Greece had rebelled against one nurse, her guardians, whose money was now invested in her, insisted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that she must have another; and, while the Greeks demanded a tried and honest statesman, like Mr. Gladstone, who would devote himself to their interests, the guardians said no, and forced her to accept a young Danish prince of untried ability, who should be a tool in their hands and further their interests. Russia, moreover, insisted that he should take a Russian wife, and that she should have a Russian private secretary, whose duty it should be to keep the Czar acquainted with everything that went on in the court—a duty which he faithfully performed.

Fortunately for Greece, King George has proved to be a good and loyal if not a very showy man. During his reign of more than thirty years, he has more and more withdrawn himself from the influence of his guardians, and has identified himself with the life and aspirations of his people. His queen, in defiance of the Czar, has done the same; while their children, born and bred in Greece, are Greek to the core. Of course, this action of his has been the cause of great fear and suspicion to his would-be guardians—especially Russia and Great Britain. These two nations, as soon as they find that they cannot control Greece, show themselves to be her bitterest enemies. For them she must be an obedient child or nothing; and the more babyish and feeble she is, the better. It is an open secret that, from the very hour of Greece's declaration of independence, Russia has done everything she could to thwart her and to prevent her from rising above absolute helplessness. Every effort to improve and open up the country has been frustrated for half a century by the underhand influence of Russia. Her purposes are clear enough. She wishes to keep both Turkey and Greece in a moribund state, until some European complication shall arise enabling her to seize the territory of both, erect her throne at Constantinople, restore the Eastern Empire, and proceed to extend it, with its Asiatic despotism, to the whole of Asia. England would fain prevent this; but she too has her selfish projects, and is strongly averse to allowing the territory of the Turk, which forms the bridge of trade between Europe and Asia, to fall into the hands of a capable, eminently commercial people like the Greeks. Thus, Russia and England, though with different motives, conspire to keep Greece in a state of childish imbecility; and herein they are seconded, from still other motives, by Austria, who wishes to appropriate the Balkan provinces and extend her dominion to the Ægean Sea. The reasons which induce Germany to make common cause with these reveal the existence of deeper and sadder motives,—of a combined effort on the part of the three empires, Russia, Austria, and Germany, to stem the whole

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modern movement toward democracy and rational freedom, and to restore the dehumanizing despotism of the Middle Ages in Church and State. Of the first and third, Mr. Gladstone well says:—

> "In the one case, the government is a pure and perfect despotism, and in the other, equivalent to it in matters of foreign policy. . . . These Powers, so far as their sentiments are known, have been using their power in the concert to fight steadily against freedom."

And the same is true of Austria. Now these facts are pitiful enough and disheartening enough; but there is something far more so, and that is, that the Powers of Europe which stand for freedom—England, France, and Italy—are so cowed by the impudent bullying of the three despots, as to allow themselves to be chained to their chariot-wheels, as these roll ruthlessly over the most sacred rights and instincts of humanity. The aristocratic element in England, represented by Lord Salisbury, who now steers her ship of state, sympathizes with the despots; and to this fact are due both the Armenian massacres and the coercion of Crete and Greece. Had Mr. Gladstone and his party been at the helm, neither of these things would have happened. France, the only really unselfish and chivalrous friend that Greece ever had, desires to remain friends with Russia, in the hope that that despotic power will some day help her to free Alsace and Lorraine from German despotism. Poor, deluded, misguided France! That will happen only when the lion lies down with the lamb. Finally, Italy, amid her chaos, fears to break with the Triple Alliance, although its other members snub her on every occasion. Thus all the Powers of Europe, led on by her despots, are combined against the progress of Greece, the freedom of Crete, in fact,—let us recognize it frankly!—against freedom altogether. Their present bearing toward Crete is but one manifestation of their general spirit: another was their bearing toward the Armenian massacres. It is perfectly fair to conclude that, had the poor, oppressed Armenians shown any likelihood of success against their oppressors, the European Powers would have sent an army to shell them into submission. It has come to this, at the close of the nineteenth Christian century!

And what excuses do the Powers put forward for their action? They are mainly three; and these are paltry and mendacious enough. They wish, they say, (1) to preserve the peace of Europe; (2) to maintain the integrity of the Turkish Empire; and (3) to insure to Greece the conditions of safe development. As to the first, could anything be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more untrue? Are they not, by refusing to Crete and Greece their just demands, endangering the peace of Europe? Let Crete unite herself to Greece, as she ought to have been allowed to do seventy years ago, and the present danger will be at an end. Turkey and Greece are willing to settle their difficulties between themselves and to restore peace; but the Powers, instead of helping them, step in to prevent them, so bent are they on war. As to the integrity of Turkey, there is no such thing to preserve. As Mr. Botassi says, in a recent article:—

"The dismemberment of Turkey began over a hundred years ago. In 1783, Turkey lost the Crimea. In 1830, she lost Greece. In 1857, Moldavia and Wallachia . . . were united, and finally became the present flourishing kingdom of Roumania in 1881. In 1862, the Turkish garrison evacuated Belgrade; and in 1878, Servia became an independent kingdom . . . and Turkey quickly acquiesced in the absorption of Eastern Roumelia in 1887. Kars and Batum were snatched by Russia in 1878. England seized Cyprus in the same year; and Austria was comfortably installed in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Where is the alleged integrity of the Turkish Empire, in the face of the above historical facts?"

Where, indeed? And there is a deeper sense in which Turkey must be denied all claim to integrity—a moral and political sense. Turkey has always been a dissolute barbarous nation, a mere band of robbers and ravishers occupying the seats of ancient civilization, bringing ruin wherever they came. It has no more claim to a place among civilized peoples than a nest of assassins, a brothel, or a gambling-hell. No government has any claim, as such, to existence, except in so far as it fulfils the function of government in promoting justice, culture, and well-being; and herein Turkey has absolutely failed, being a mere organ of injustice, savagery, and misery. It ought incontinently to be swept from the face of the earth, as a moral nuisance and horror, and its place given to the Greeks, who, though not without faults, everywhere represent freedom, education, culture, energy. Lastly, as to the desire on the part of the Powers to ensure to Greece the conditions of safe development, no more mendacious pretence was ever put forward. The truth is, the Powers, with the exception of France and, perhaps, Italy, are utterly opposed to the development of Greece, and would abolish her to-morrow if they felt strong enough to defy public opinion. Thus one and all the pleas put forward by the Powers for their dastardly behavior to Crete and Greece are mere pieces of falsehood and impudence, such as the foes of freedom are forced to screen themselves with to avoid public scorn.

With regard to Crete, in particular, the Powers tell us that they are willing to grant her autonomy under the suzerainty of the Turk!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Autonomy" is a fine, vague, oracular word, a word to conjure with: unfortunately it has, thus far, only started devils, as the Cretans, whom the Powers are trying to dupe with it, know to their cost. All that the Powers want is to keep Crete from joining Greece and entering on the path of civilization until such time as some one of them is in a position to grab it with impunity. And so, in defiance of all political and human rights, they are protecting, arming, and aiding the Turks,—aye, even the savage Bashi-bazouks,—and shelling the Christians, who are risking their lives for liberty. Is it any wonder that the Cretans have lost all faith in the Powers?

There is one more very insidious plea often put forward by the Powers in defence of their conduct to Greece. They tell us that the Greeks, being excitable, headstrong, and new to political life, are not fit to govern a large territory; still less to take the place of the Turk, and govern a mass of peoples of different races and religions and hostile to each other; and that, since all their efforts at aggrandizement tend in this direction, the people must be frowned down, thwarted, and enfeebled. This conclusion is, indeed, made a rule of action; but the premise, I believe, is utterly false and calumnious. Since my first visit to Greece, twenty years ago, I have watched the life and progress of her people; and I know few things that are more encouraging. Despite all the vexations to which their guardians have subjected them, and all the obstacles they have thrown in their way, despite also their own natural shortcomings, they have shown, in both material and spiritual things, all the virtues of a progressive and civilized people. Their country, left them a desert by the Turks, has become, to a large extent, productive and beautiful. The population, now 2,600,000, has doubled in the last twenty years. In 1877, there were hardly a hundred miles of carriage-roads, and only five miles of railway in the whole country. To-day, there are roads everywhere, and hundreds of miles of railway. In 1877, it was hardly possible for the traveller to find a bed outside Athens: to-day, there are numerous hotels, with all European conveniences, in all the principal cities and towns. But the true test and proof of Greece's indomitable spirit of culture is her educational system. By that she stands or falls. I have visited Greek schools throughout the length and breadth of the land, from the infant-school kept by the peasant in the open air, against a sunny hovel-wall, to the Arsakeion, or girls' academy, and the noble university, with 2,200 students, which now grace and honor the city of Athene. Anyone who will do the same, and listen to the records of the sacrifices made by rich and poor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the sake of education and culture, will not doubt for a moment that Greece is amply able to govern and civilize the lands now marred and wasted by Turkish misrule. The sums of money given by rich Greeks for schools, and the hardships undergone by the children of the poor in remote districts to avail themselves of these have no parallel anywhere, save in the United States and Scotland. Who dares assert of such a people that it is not capable of ruling its ancient patrimony—the first home of liberty—better than the barbarous Turk or the despotic Russian? There is but one just, beneficent, and effective solution of the Eastern Question, and that is the restoration of the Greek Empire to Greece, and the placing of a great civilizing Power, such as neither Turkey nor Russia can ever be, as guardian of the bridge between Europe and Asia. It is the disgrace of Europe that this was not done long ago.

But the question remains: What can we, citizens of the United States, do in the matter? We can do a great deal, both in our private and in our public capacity. We can do what our people did at the time of the Greek Revolution: we can give Greece our moral and material support. We can rouse the free spirit that animates our people and let it find expression through the press, through public resolutions, through motions in the national Senate and House of Representatives, and, finally, in formal encouragement and protest expressed through the Chief of the Executive and his foreign ministers. But we must not stop here. We must find another Dr. Howe, and send him with shiploads of food and clothing, not only to those Cretans who, in dread of butchery or worse, have fled from their native land and are starving in Athens, but to those who cannot get away, and whose food the soldiers of Great Britain have burned. Then, if the Powers refuse permission to our ships to land, on their errand of humanity and mercy, we must enter such a protest as President Cleveland entered against English encroachment upon Venezuela, backed by the same drastic sanction. *That* protest will be listened to, as the other was; for there is one country that the bullies of Europe dare not bully, and that is the United States. If we follow this course, which is our simple duty to humanity, we shall find a warm response from the great popular heart of the elder continent, and rouse a healthy public opinion that will cow tyrants, paralyze bullies, and wipe out the ignominy of Europe ere she have to blush in the light of a new century.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR EXPORT TRADE.

AMERICAN commerce was first colonial, is now national, and must become international. In the earlier period of our industrial life, it was natural that the energies of our people should be applied mainly to the discovery and development of our vast and varied resources, to the construction of post-roads, canals, and great systems of railways, to the establishment and extension of inland navigation, to the building of towns and cities, and to the founding of manufacturing industries. One development stimulated another, and thus produced finally an era of unexampled prosperity. A period of depression followed, owing largely to the fact that "we were our own best customers"; our power of production and our output of manufactures far exceeded the demand for home consumption; and one-half of our industrial energy had to lie unemployed. Such is our situation to-day. The present, therefore, seems a most fitting time to discuss the influence of our export trade upon our national prosperity.

In this latest period of contraction, particularly during the past year, the importance of our exports has been brought home to our people. Financiers have appreciated it because the large balance of trade in our favor ($325,322,184) the last year has not only enabled us to buy back our securities at low prices from foreign holders, but has assisted in the accumulation of large gold reserves. Our farmers have found, as before, markets abroad for their surplus products. But, above all, the export trade proved a special blessing to our manufacturers, who, under the impulse of an abnormal home demand, had developed a productive capacity double the requirements of our domestic trade. During the past four years, if it had not been for the sustaining power of foreign orders, many factories would have been forced to close; thus breaking up organizations which it had required years to perfect, and throwing laborers out of work at a time when they would have been unable to obtain other employment. How foreign orders came to the rescue of many of our manufacturers is seen from the Treasury reports, which show that our exports of manufactured goods increased during the three months preceding the last election 72 per

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cent over the corresponding months of 1892, while our bank clearings for the same period—the only statistics we have for measuring interstate commerce—decreased 20 per cent. Hitherto our trade in manufactured goods has been almost exclusively among ourselves; but during the recent years of depression the feeling has grown that the only way out of our straits is through commerce with all the world. Thus will be brought about an industrial revival that will end the present popular discontent.

Mr. E. V. Smalley, in the March number of THE FORUM, states that the conditions which made possible the abnormally prosperous times in this country from 1879 to 1892 no longer exist. "Our new West," he says, "is already fairly well peopled. . . . Our great transcontinental railway systems are already constructed. . . . Our new towns and cities went rather beyond the capacity of the tributary country to support them. . . ." While it is desirable that discontent should be replaced by the contentment of industry, it would not be wise to wish for a return of "boom times." We can and should build on a broader, and therefore safer, foundation. We cannot remain wholly dependent for our active industrial life upon the home demand; and the markets of the world are open to us, ready to absorb the surplus products of our utmost manufacturing capacity. Economists recognize that the industrial greatness of a nation depends on the possession of the main sources of mechanical energy—coal and water-power—and of abundant deposits of iron ore. That nation which has the cheaper fuel and cheaper iron has a steady advantage in the contest for supremacy in the world's trade. Besides being singularly endowed with these inestimable gifts of nature, the United States has also every variety of soil and climate, great forests, and the best natural facilities for inland transportation. Our people are gifted in a marked degree with inventive genius and untiring energy; and all their forces, mental, moral, and physical, are disposable for civil and economic ends, being free from the enormous drain of men and money demanded by standing armies. Wages are higher in the United States than in the more densely populated countries: but we have met that condition in many industries by utilizing the best labor-saving machinery and methods; thus effecting economies through centralization of manufacture.

Every dollar's worth of merchandise exported represents just so much wealth given by the foreigner in exchange for our own people's industry. It is, therefore, natural that we should supplement our great interstate commerce—the greatest commercial intercourse in the world

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conducted under the conditions of absolute free trade—by securing markets abroad. A comparatively small additional demand often turns bad times into good times. The total wealth of the United States is about $80,000,000,000; the total amount of money is about $2,300,000,000; yet at times, if the bank reserves of New York decline ten millions, anxiety is created in financial circles, and money required for the legitimate wants of trade is unobtainable. But if the reserves advance ten millions, money becomes a drug in the market. So it is with our industries. A moderate increase in the sale of our products abroad would give an impulse to some of our industries, which would stimulate others and thus bring about a wholesome industrial activity.

In widening our field of distribution, there are several reasons why it is most important to create markets for our *manufactured* goods, including flour, canned foods, and other manufactures of farm products, as distinguished from "raw materials."

(1) The percentage of profit on manufactured goods is much larger than on raw material. The French best appreciate this. Importing the crude products of other countries, they add to them features that please the eye and gratify the taste, and thus make a vastly greater profit than the producers of the raw materials.

(2) There is a greater necessity to widen our market for manufactured goods. Raw materials are readily marketed; and though it requires much time and expense to build up a trade in manufactured goods, yet, when once developed, it is not only more profitable than that in raw materials, but is less vulnerable to competition.

During recent periods of depression, the manufacturers who had had the foresight to introduce their goods into foreign countries secured most of the orders for export, and were making substantial profits while their neighbors were forced to close their factories or run at great loss.

(3) The United States is becoming yearly more of a manufacturing nation. The value of our exports of manufactured products in 1870 was $68,279,764; in 1890, $151,102,376; and in 1896, $228,489,893. While these figures show a large increase, the largest shipment of manufactured goods in any one year ($228,489,893) is small as compared with our capacity and opportunities, and with the exports of manufactures by our competitors of Western Europe. The latter reach an annual value of $3,500,000,000. Our export trade is less than one-fifteenth of this.

The vital question arises, How can this export trade be developed? The answer is: (1) By the establishment of international banking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facilities based upon a currency of undoubted stability; (2) by controlling means of transportation; (3) by manufacturing what is most suitable for the needs of foreign markets; (4) by proper legislation, commercial treaties, and intelligent representation abroad; and (5) by manufacturing products of good quality at low cost.

One of the first steps to take toward the extension of our export trade in the neutral markets should be the establishment of our own banking facilities. In London alone there are no less than sixty incorporated banks, having for their sole function the conduct of international finance as related to commerce; and these have branches and agencies in all foreign ports. Similar banking institutions exist in France and Germany for coöperation with the exporters of each of those countries; but there is not an American bank, or branch of an American bank, in South America, Africa, or Asia. Our merchants and manufacturers are dependent for banking accommodations—which would be largely withdrawn in case of war or rumors of war—upon institutions principally under the control and influence of their competitors abroad. By act of Congress, an invitation was extended to the representatives of eighteen American republics to assemble in Washington for the purpose of providing means for the extension of inter-American trade. That conference recommended the establishment of an international American bank, with branches in all the American republics; thus committing the South American governments to its support. No charter has yet been granted, although the bill introduced into Congress provided that the bank, while subject to governmental supervision, should not receive governmental assistance nor have the right of issue.

There are grave objections to the Government directly assisting private enterprises; but it is nevertheless true that the export trade is greatly increased by improved facilities of communication. Every vessel flying the American flag "is a commercial traveller for the American farmer and manufacturer." By possessing superior means of communication, Europe, though more distant, is nearer to South America in point of time than the United States. Lines of steamships to South America could be established, if aided with liberal mail contracts by our own and other interested governments. The ships should fly the flags of the United States and of the republics of South America. Our Southern neighbors are looking forward with interest to the time when we shall be joined together by a system of intercontinental railways; thus establishing close commercial union. Awaiting that consummation, they are to-day prepared to respond to a movement on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of this country to facilitate steamship communication. They believe it would be an additional source of national strength, as well as of commercial advantage.

In order to develop trade with foreign countries, it is necessary that we should manufacture what they want, and as they want it, instead of insisting upon their taking what we are producing for home consumption. With a comparatively small export trade, the manufacturer often finds it inconvenient to supply the special wants of foreign markets; but, as his export trade increases, this difficulty decreases. When a foreign trade is once secured it should be held. Owing to the rapidity with which American demand sometimes springs up, manufacturers, who rely naturally and properly upon the home market as their principal support, forget the advantage to be had from an export trade in times of depression, and advance their prices too rapidly as against the foreign buyer and refuse to meet his special requirements. He becomes disgusted, and reverts to his former sources of supply in Europe; and it is much harder to regain a foreign customer once lost than it is to secure a new one.

The question of legislation as affecting our export trade, is too complex to be discussed comprehensively within the limits of this article. Substantial advantages would have been secured from reciprocity arrangements had they been continued. It is natural and proper that we should ask countries from whom we are buying four times as much as they are taking from us, to facilitate the interchange of products. We bought last year from Brazil, La Plata, and the Spanish West Indies, $126,000,000, and we sold them only $30,000,000,—the balance against us being $96,000,000, which we had to remit in gold to Europe to pay for manufactured goods which those countries bought from Europe instead of from us. While reciprocal arrangements are of undoubted benefit, the field of opportunity under reciprocity is small, as compared with the greater opportunities obtainable through economic manufacture.

It is important that we should be represented in our diplomatic and consular service by men of experience and industry, speaking the languages of the countries to which they are accredited. The present Administration can lead reform in this respect by reappointing capable men who have become familiar with the countries in which they have served. Such representatives—particularly those accredited to our Southern neighbors—would be of valuable assistance, in bringing about a simplification and unification of customs regulations and generally in assisting to develop inter-American trade.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The most important element in securing foreign trade is price. The average wages of Western Europe are less than half those of the United States; and the serious question is, How can we compete with countries paying much lower wages? Many advocate the reduction of wages; arguing that the reduced prices which would follow would largely increase the demand for products, thus stimulating the demand for labor. The reduction in prices, being equal to the reduction in the rate of wages, would enable the wage-earner to buy then as much as he can now; and, instead of working half-time, as at present, he would have continuous employment and thus earn a larger annual income.

In considering the question of wages, however, we should look at it from a higher point of view than that of cost. Undoubtedly a reduction of wages would enormously increase demand at home and abroad. But is not the general distribution of wealth in this country through the payment of high wages an element of national benefit? Is it not a guarantee of national unity and strength that so many of our wage-earners own their homes, and that our savings-bank deposits are rapidly increasing, now amounting to more than $1,800,000,000? There are instances where the workman would undoubtedly be benefited by a reduction of wages; and in several recent cases the leaders of labor combinations have favored a reduction of wages in order to increase employment in their localities. A radical reduction in wages, such as would have taken place had we gone upon a silver basis,—"cutting money in two and cutting wages in two,"—would undoubtedly have increased our exports; but the same benefits can be secured without putting our laborers on the European plane. The cost of production can be reduced by utilizing the advantages of consolidation; by the adoption of whatever is best in methods, machinery, styles, and materials;—points generally ascertainable only through comparison of the processes of different establishments brought together by combination;—by closing obsolete, badly located plants, and perfecting the best; by the reduction (by centralization) of the percentage of general expenses of factory superintendence, buying, selling, accounting, and advertising; by running full time because of added orders for export; by eliminating litigation through a common ownership of conflicting patents; by discarding needless brands and styles; by stimulating interest and effort through distribution of ownership in centralized manufacture; by supplanting with sound, honest goods the inferior, and often counterfeit, goods produced by obsolete machinery and poor organization. With these advantages—and without cutting wages—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we can maintain and extend our position in the markets of the world. We are shipping steel billets to England, where the laborer in steel plants gets far lower wages than are paid at Pittsburgh. We are supplying refined oil to China and Japan, where the laborer gets 12c. per day as against $1.50 paid in our refineries. We ship straight cotton goods to the neutral markets, agricultural implements even to the nations of Europe, machinery and tools to every part of the globe.

European manufacturers, even with their low wages, have been recently agitated by the industrial activity which has manifested itself in Japan. The people of whom Mulhall, the British statistician, was able to say, two years ago, "If we take a survey of mankind in ancient or modern times, as regards the physical, mechanical, and intellectual force of nations, we find nothing to compare with the United States," may view without alarm the threatened competition of the Japanese and Chinese in manufacture. The productive capacity of our labor-saving implements and machinery is greater than that of the entire population of China. We have no stronger guarantee for the future prosperity of the country than the maintenance of the high standard of intelligence of the American artisan; and we require that superior intelligence to use highly organized machinery and labor-saving implements which take the place of the "pauper labor" of other countries.

That we hold our position in the world's markets through such superior organization is shown by the fact that of our exports of manufactured goods 85% are produced by the organizations representing centralized manufactures; while those articles the manufacture of which cannot be centralized to advantage are being supplied to the neutral markets by the countries that have low-priced labor. With our high wages we cannot compete with Europe in paying close attention to individual wants; but by centralization we can manufacture in great quantities for the masses goods of uniform and better quality for the price.

The most serious obstacle to our continued advance in the exportation of manufactured goods is indicated in the recent opinion delivered by Judge Peckham, of the Supreme Court. He admits that,

"In business or trading combinations they may even temporarily, or perhaps permanently, reduce the price of the article traded in or manufactured, by reducing the expense inseparable from the running of many different companies for the same purpose. Trade or commerce under those circumstances may nevertheless be badly and unfortunately restrained by driving out of business the small dealers. . . . Mere reduction in the price of the commodity dealt in might be dearly paid for by the ruin of such a class."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is impossible to protect that class. The law of the "survival of the fittest" is inexorable; and attempts by Government to favor the few result in loss to the many. No human law can ever be devised to take the place of that higher law which gives a monopoly to superior intelligence.

If the evolution in economic manufacturing is to be interfered with and legislative enactments are to be substituted for natural laws, if world competition is to be prohibited by preventing combination, on which low prices depend, the result will be less employment, low wages, and consequent pauperization of American labor. The wars of to-day are industrial wars; and the essential element of success is low cost of production. That can be best secured through centralized production. At the present time an attempt is being made by demagogues in journalism and politics to gain popular favor by appealing to popular discontent. Bad times are largely due to the attempt to "hold up" capital and enterprise; and the march of progress is thus retarded. But our struggle for a share in the markets of the world goes on. The consumer fighting for low cost of living, the workman to maintain the American standard of wages, the Captains of Industry fighting for low cost of production through centralization, upon which the maintenance of wages depends,

"in mutual, well-beseeming ranks, march all one way."

The existence of a great export trade in the United States would have an educative influence on our people. It would cause them to look at great economic questions from a higher point of view. Contrasting their wages with those of other countries would tend to make our laborers satisfied with their more favored condition. The farmer would realize his dependence on facilities for transportation by land and sea; and granger agitation would gradually cease. Our manufacturers would be stimulated to renewed efforts to occupy this wider field; and the Legislature would be forced to study—closely and intelligently—national finances and trade not from the standpoint of narrow partisanship or local conditions, but from the higher ground of the rights of all and the general good, and in view of the ultimate domination of the universal law of supply and demand.

CHARLES R. FLINT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INDUSTRIAL COMBINATIONS.

WITH the exception of the problems relating to the currency, the question of industrial combinations is probably the most absorbing one before the American people to-day. It is worthy of the careful study of every patriotic citizen, of the earnest, vigorous efforts of our wisest statesmen. It seems likely, on the contrary, to become rather the plaything of empirics, or the tool of political charlatans. In many States legislation on this subject is pending,—crude, undigested, and revolutionary,—which, if enacted and enforced, will retard the industrial development of the country and increase the evil it is intended to eradicate.

These combinations of capital assume many forms; but in general they may be divided into two classes—*permanent* and *transitory*. The first of these may be subdivided into consolidations and trusts; which, however, are simply different means of reaching the same end—the merging of two or more competitive establishments into one concern under one management. In a consolidation this is done openly. There is one central or general office; and the different plants are operated as branches. In a trust, on the other hand, certain individuals hold, as trustees for the actual owners, all the capital stock of different corporations engaged in the same line of manufacture. These subsidiary companies continue to operate their respective plants,—apparently independently of each other, but in reality guided in all their movements by the trustees. This form of combination has of late years been severely handled by the courts; and most of the industries which were once operated under trust agreements have reorganized as corporations.

Permanent consolidation of interests, whether arrived at by an open merger or the more subtle form of a trust, is the only perfect combination. All others are mere makeshifts for the purpose of temporary profit at the expense of the consumer. This is a means whereby permanent and substantial benefits can be secured, always for the combination itself, and occasionally for the public. It is at once impregnable and remorseless. Unless it openly and persistently flies in the face of public opinion, it is absolutely beyond the reach of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law; for it is hard to conceive how any law can be enacted and enforced which, without infringing on private rights or interfering with industrial development, can prevent a corporation, or a private firm, or an individual from owning and operating plants in different parts of the country, even if such ownership does involve the control or monopoly of any given commodity.

If one of these aggregations is safely launched, thoroughly organized, and ably managed, it can go a long way toward making its position impregnable and holding it in perpetuity. It can shut down a sufficient number of its plants to prevent over-production of the commodity it manufactures, and thereby make sure of a profit the extent of which is measured only by the moderation or rapacity of its management. Able, conservative, and far-sighted managers will dictate a policy of low prices, which will disarm public criticism as well as discourage private competition. If a daring competitor refuses to capitulate, or a new competitor appears, one or more of the plants of the consolidation can be detailed to follow his salesman into every market, and undersell him at every point, no matter what the loss may be, until at last he sees before him the alternative of bankruptcy or surrender. If the new competitor is backed by such ample capital, or his affairs are so well-managed, that the loss involved in the crushing-out process would be too great, another and simpler means is employed. Able negotiators are set to work; and the new competitor is either bought outright, or a new consolidation is effected, or an understanding is arrived at under which the two apparent competitors will, for the future, work in harmony. These efforts are nearly always successful: for commerce knows no sentiment; and in business it is true, almost without qualification, that "every man has his price."

But the ablest and strongest efforts of the combinations are directed not toward the stifling of competition, but at forestalling it. In other words, when once intrenched in a commanding position, they aim to reduce the cost of manufacture so that they can undersell old competitors and discourage new ones. All that science can devise or human ingenuity invent in the way of labor-saving machinery is taken advantage of; and the records of the United States Patent Office show that most of the great inventions (and, indeed, many of the great inventors) of recent years are owned by corporations who use them to maintain and, as far as possible, perpetuate their various monopolies. Their establishments being located at different points, they can ship to each locality from the plant most convenient; effecting a large saving

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in freight as against a competitor who ships from one point only. While the general expenses, or what are known to the trade as "fixed charges," of such concerns are necessarily large, their output is so great that when these charges are divided by the unit of product they are invariably less than those of smaller producers. Being purchasers of the largest class, and generally of undoubted credit, they can in most cases secure their raw material and supplies of various kinds at the lowest possible cost. By comparing the record of one plant with another, they are able to introduce into the entire system small economies, each meaning little in itself, but amounting in the aggregate to enough to insure a fair profit on the whole investment. In short, they are able in the highest degree to exemplify the saying, "In union there is strength"; and, with the strength born of a common and united purpose, they attack fearlessly and destroy relentlessly all who stand in the way of their onward march.

But in many branches of trade where over-competition exists it is found impracticable to consolidate all interests. In fact it is the exception that this can be done. In such cases, resort is had to a "pool"; which means that, as there is not enough business for all, what there is shall be divided among the different members in proportion to their capacity,—or that some members shall take the entire business, paying the others a certain proportion of the profits in compensation for their enforced idleness. To raise this money each member taking any of the business is compelled to pay into the pool all, or a certain proportion of his profits; and these profits, after paying expenses, are divided back among the members in proportion to their respective percentages—the percentages being fixed at the time of organization, and generally based on capacity. In this way, the man who stands idle makes approximately as much money as the one who operates his plant and continues in active business. If a manufacturer is obdurate, and refuses to join the pool, an effort is made to subsidize him, either by paying him a stipulated sum per month for shutting down, or by agreeing to purchase his product at a price which will yield him a large profit. To provide for such payments and other like "contingent expenses," a certain percentage of the pool payments is set aside from time to time. Some of these organizations even go so far as to subsidize the manufacturers of machinery adapted for the turning out of the product which is "pooled," in order to discourage new competition.

Such is a brief outline of the operations of the organizations called "pools." They vary in details; but the general form is the same. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all involve a contribution by those who run, for the benefit of those who do not. A brief study of this plan will easily demonstrate that these associations bear in themselves, from their very inception, the seeds of their own destruction. They are vulnerable both from without and within. Even if the original or basic percentages are adjusted in a manner satisfactory to all parties (which seldom happens), it is not long before some member convinces himself that he is entitled to a larger share, and demands a readjustment. This invariably causes trouble, and often leads to a shipwreck before the bark has been fairly launched. Being composed of men whose natural attitude toward each other is one of intense competition, there is of necessity no cohesion amongst them, except, perhaps, "the cohesive power of plunder"; and their meetings generally resemble a council of war composed of allies hastily gathered together to oppose a common enemy, but whose traditions and anticipations alike point to a long line of conflicts with each other. Formed of such discordant elements, looking backward to a competitive past and forward to a time when that competition will be intensified by the very reason of their present truce, it can be easily seen that profits—immediate, continuous, and enormous—are a necessity to their existence; and the moment the profits cease (even temporarily), the structure falls.

The excessive prices demanded for their goods by the members of the pool naturally attract the attention of the outside world; and it is not long before a new crop of competitors appears. These competitors must be bought off if the pool is to continue, or they will gradually attract the business to themselves. To do this, prices must be still further advanced, and a continually increasing proportion of the pool profits must be set aside for "contingencies." As a result, the short life of the pool is one of continual warfare, with certain defeat at the end. I can now recall but a single instance where one of these organizations continued in successful operation over a number of years; and this it was enabled to do only by reason of the fact that the business controlled by it involved so enormous a capital as to deter outsiders from entering the lists against it. But even this combination, seemingly irresistible, has at last succumbed to the natural laws of business; and its downfall has just been chronicled. It has but few mourners; and these are not inconsolable.

In considering the question of the good or evil effect of these combinations, the above division of them into two classes—permanent and transitory—should always be kept in view. These two classes bear to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each other about the same relation that a barn-stormer bears to a Booth or an Irving, or a penny-a-liner to one of the masters of literature. Of the transitory combinations but little that is good can be said, even by their strongest advocates. The most plausible argument in their favor lies in the fact that they allow the profits of a business to be divided among all who are engaged in it; whereas by unrestricted competition the entire business would be gradually absorbed by those who are best equipped, and the weaker ones would be driven to the wall. There is no doubt that the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest," when put into practical operation, is an extremely hard one, for the survivors as well as for the vanquished; but that is no justification for the unscrupulous rapacity which characterizes the operation of most pools, when for a brief period they gain control of the output of any article of general consumption. When everything possible is said in their favor, the conclusion is irresistible that, both in their effect on the public and their ultimate influence on the participants themselves, their result is absolutely and unqualifiedly bad. The evil that results from them, however, is neither far-reaching nor permanent in its nature; for their lives are necessarily short ones, and, when they die, an era of low prices invariably follows their funeral. It is questionable, therefore, whether, on the whole, the public is much the worse for these fitful attempts at combination.

The question of the merits and demerits of combinations, when they take the form of a complete consolidation of interests, is a far more difficult one to solve. I will present as briefly as possible some of the arguments advanced by the advocates of these organizations to prove that their existence is a benefit and not an injury to the public.

In the first place, a very large proportion of the general expenses of a manufacturer are caused, directly or indirectly, by competition; and, if competition be eliminated, many of these expenses can be cut off. If a dozen concerns are engaged in selling the same article in competition with each other, all of them must have salesmen patrolling the country, or agents representing them in each district. Each concern must also spend large sums in calling the attention of the public, through the newspapers or by other methods of advertising, to the merits of its goods. All these expenses, which in the aggregate are enormous, can be divided almost exactly by twelve if the plants are combined under one management. Each one of the twelve must also maintain a general office with a large salary list; and, while expenses of this kind are not wiped out by consolidation, they can be largely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reduced. Another item of saving lies in the purchase of the various raw materials and supplies used in their different plants. On account of the great volume of their purchases and, generally, their ample capital and ready payments, their trade is eagerly sought after; and they are usually able to buy everything they need at much lower prices than could be obtained by even the best of their constituent members when operating separately. When we consider that, as a rule, the cost of raw material amounts to about 60 per cent of the value of the manufactured article (I allude to staple articles, not to specialties), it will be seen what an advantage is gained by this ability to purchase everything at the lowest price.

But the chief advantage possessed by these combinations, and one which overshadows all others, lies in the ability to cheapen the cost of manufacturing by the introduction of careful and intelligent management into their various operating departments. When once a merger is effected, and the managers are able to compare the past records of the various plants, it is invariably found that, owing to abler management or better facilities, some plants were turning out their product at a much lower cost than others. Under the new régime all this is at once changed. Incompetent managers are discharged; and the methods which before prevailed in the most favored and best equipped plants are introduced into all. If it is found that there is a greater aggregate capacity than the legitimate consumption demands, some plants—usually those in which the cost of operating is greatest—are closed down, and the remainder operated to their full capacity. In this way each plant is enabled to turn out the maximum of product at the minimum of cost,—which is the perfection of manufacturing. This may seem hard for the workmen in the idle plants, who are thrown out of employment; and so it is. But it must be remembered that the aggregate of labor employed is as great in the one instance as in the other. It is simply shifted from one place to another; and a smaller number of men are employed on full time, instead of a greater number working short hours only. From my own observation, extending over many years, and including all branches of manufacture, I am satisfied that combinations of this kind are not inimical to the interests of the workingman. On the contrary, the men employed by them receive steadier employment, and generally at better wages, than the same class of labor under open competition. In fact, reductions in wages are oftener brought about by excessive competition than by any other cause. If one competitor reduces wages, the others are of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessity compelled to follow; and the laborer, who is least able to help himself, is ground between the upper and nether millstones. When there is a virtual monopoly of the trade, this necessity does not exist; and instances are very rare in which manufacturers have compelled their employees to accept reduced wages, unless driven thereto by sheer necessity. It is the least grateful task that is laid on the manager, and the one that is last resorted to.

Having stated, and I believe fairly, the main arguments advanced in favor of these artificial combinations, let us look at those presented on the other side. The chief of these are, the watering of their stock, and the consequent necessity of extorting high prices for their products in order to pay dividends on the inflated values; their unscrupulous course in maintaining a monopoly of trade and in dealing with their competitors; and the fact that in many of them the guiding motive in the conduct of their business is not the good of the business itself, but the effect it will have on values in Wall Street.

If all the firms and companies engaged in a certain line of manufacture would unite,—making the capital of the united company equal to the fair aggregate value of the several plants, with the addition of sufficient cash to provide working capital,—and would avail themselves of all the advantages I have outlined, it is beyond question that they could defy competition, sell their wares at prices lower than ever before known, and still reap for themselves a liberal return on their legitimate investment. This, however, is not the course usually followed. In an investigation into this subject, lately conducted by a committee of the New York Legislature, it was developed that, in the organization of one of these companies, stock to the amount of about $5,000,000 was issued for live assets and about $20,000,000 for "good-will"; and there are many other instances of a like nature. In other words, the stock was watered to the extent of five times its legitimate value. In order to pay dividends on this inflated value, it is of course necessary to advance the price of goods far beyond what is fair and right, and to extort from the public money which without question comes under the head of "ill-gotten gains." This, it must be confessed, is the course pursued by most of the so-called trusts. There are, however, honorable exceptions: but the exceptions are few; and the rule applies to the many. One of the notable exceptions is the oldest and ablest concern of them all, which for a quarter of a century has held almost undisputed sway over one of our greatest industries. To-day it has the power to fix, and actually does fix from day to day,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the prices at which it will buy its raw material and sell its product. The sellers of the one and the buyers of the other are compelled perforce to bow to its dictates; but this absolute power is wielded with a far-seeing liberality that, considering its opportunities, is amazing. Its securities are not used as a football to be kicked from side to side on the Stock Exchange; and the time, energy, and brains of its managers are devoted exclusively to the conduct of its legitimate business. It is noticeable that this company has, to a certain extent, escaped the universal criticism which has been heaped upon organizations of a like character during the past few years. Yet, even in this instance, the upward path to power is strewn with the wrecks of competitors; and, though the company in question has laid the foundations of colossal fortunes, it has made many men poor.

As to the remedy: It is now nearly seven years since Congress placed on the statute-books of the nation a law making it a misdemeanor for any individual, corporation, or association to monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, and providing for the punishment of the same by fine, or imprisonment, or both. This law emanated from the pen of the present distinguished Secretary of State; and, so far as its motive goes, it is a tribute to the patriotism of that wise and experienced statesman. The legislatures of several States have also enacted laws looking to the same end. That of Illinois has attracted especial attention by reason of the drastic nature of its provisions, and the vigorous efforts of the Attorney General to enforce it. Yet in no period of our history have artificial organizations in restraint of trade run riot to such an extent as during the years that these laws have been in force; and in no place, with the possible exception of the city of New York, have their operations been more conspicuous than in Chicago. The explanation is not hard to find. No law can be continuously enforced which makes a crime out of that which the average, every-day common sense of the people does not recognize as criminal. The man who violates the Sherman Law is no more a criminal than a fraudulent bankrupt is an honest man because the law has discharged him from the payment of his debts. If this law were rigorously enforced, and every man guilty of its infraction were punished according to its provisions, many of our great lines of commerce would soon have to be entrusted to mediocre hands; for our ablest and brightest men of affairs would be denizens of the penitentiary.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been freely charged that a protective tariff is the parent of combinations; and it is proposed that Congress shall empower the President to place upon the free list any article which, after investigation, he finds to be controlled by a monopoly or a trust. This is good so far as it goes; but I prophesy that it will afford but scant relief. Many of the great industries are not now dependent on the tariff for their existence. They are no longer infants: they are able to stand alone. The withdrawal of protection will, therefore, do them no harm. But, in my opinion, the contention itself is altogether erroneous, and the facts will by no means bear it out. It is well known to all users of the commodity affected that the most successful pool carried on during the last year was among the manufacturers of an article which is, and for years has been, free of duty, and the demand for which has been supplied, in a large measure, from abroad. This pool was worked by the simple but very effectual method of distributing the business in agreed proportions between the foreign and home manufacturers. The whole thing was carried out very quietly. The price of the commodity was nearly doubled; the consumers had to pay; and the "combiners" smiled with a smile that extended across the ocean. In this one case at least, the revocation of the tariff would have accomplished no good.

I contend that combination in trade is not an evil *per se*, but only by reason of its abuse. The tendency of the times is toward consolidation and coöperation. The people have a right to demand that articles of general use shall be made at the lowest possible cost, and sold at the lowest possible price consistent with a fair return to the producer. To do this they must be produced on a large scale, with little waste, and under the best management. The evil results spring from the abuse by monopolies, or partial monopolies, of the privileges they enjoy, and from the fact that these privileges are often used as instruments of injustice and extortion. It is to this abuse of power that the attention of our law-makers should be directed. In short, the effort to *abolish* combinations having failed, let an effort be made to *regulate* them. Let us avail ourselves of what is good in them and, as far as possible, extirpate what is evil.

Ten years ago Congress undertook, with marked success, to regulate the methods of the great corporations engaged in transporting freight and passengers from State to State. It seems to me that it is just as feasible to control the operations of the great industrial corporations,—especially those engaged in the production of staple articles necessary to the daily life and well-being of the citizen. These corpo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rations all depend upon legislation, either State or national, for their existence. They are in the daily enjoyment of franchises granted by the public. They are, without exception, engaged in commerce between the States, and are consequently legitimate subjects for congressional action. I would propose, therefore, either to enlarge the duties of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or to create a new tribunal with ample powers to investigate the methods of corporations, associations, or individuals engaged in the manufacture or supply of articles of general or public use. Upon the complaint or relation of any citizen, setting forth that such corporation had obtained a substantial monopoly of any industry, and by reason thereof was oppressing the public by extortionate charges or unjust regulations as to trade, it should be the duty of this tribunal to summon the parties and, after a full hearing, to award damages to the party injured, to punish the delinquent by a heavy fine, and to certify its decision to the Governor of the State in which it was incorporated, with a recommendation of the withdrawal of its charter privileges. This, of course, would involve legislation by the various States as well as by Congress; but I feel certain that if Congress would take up the matter in earnest the States would not be slow to follow. I would also provide that the fine should be increased with each succeeding offence, so that industrial corporations would soon find from experience that it is better to be satisfied with a fair profit than to extort unearned money from a helpless public. I would likewise make it a misdemeanor, punishable by fine, for any manufacturer, corporate or otherwise, to attempt to fix the price at which his customer should sell his goods after he had once purchased them, or in any other way to interfere with the free movement of his products after they were out of his possession.

I am aware that this plan will meet with strong opposition,—and none will oppose it more vigorously than those in control of monopolies, who are perfectly willing to work under the ban of a prohibitory law which they know to be impossible of enforcement, but will protest against a reasonable proposition to limit their exorbitant gains. I am also aware that many strong and cogent arguments can be brought against it; but I believe those in its favor will far outweigh them, and that if the plan be once tried it will, to a certain extent at least, solve the problem of industrial combinations, and lift many heavy burdens from the shoulders of the people.

GEORGE T. OLIVER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW-ENGLAND INFLUENCES IN FRENCH CANADA.

THE causes of the exodus from the Province of Quebec are not political, but economic. Quebec is larger than France, or any State of the Union except Texas; but the cultivable portion consists of a mere fringe on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, with a somewhat wider strip between the St. Lawrence and the United States frontier. All else belongs to the subarctic desert of rock, muskeg, and jack-pine. The settlements of New France lay to the north of the river and on the south shore from the Etchemin eastward to Gaspé; and when, forty or fifty years ago, they became overcrowded, population flowed into the southern forests, known as the Bois-Francs,—now a well-settled country traversed by the Grand Trunk,—and into the Eastern townships, which were peopled in the early part of the century by stragglers from the United States and emigrants from Great Britain. It also crossed the Ottawa on the west into Upper Canada, and is still moving slowly along the line of the Canadian Pacific and the water-stretches between the Ottawa and Lake Huron.

The French Canadian is of a roaming disposition, and, as everyone knows, bore a conspicuous part in the exploration of the Western and Northwestern States; while in the Canadian Northwest, where he served the fur companies, he became the progenitor of a race of half-breeds. After the political troubles of 1837, and during the Anti-Slavery War,—when they got bounties for soldiering,—a good many French Canadians migrated to the neighboring States; but the rush did not begin till the depression of agriculture set in, about 1880.

Like the New-England States, Quebec has long ceased to grow wheat for export. The soil, except in favored spots, is thin; the whole region, geologists say, having been planed by the same ice-cap that passed over New England. Much of the arable land has been exhausted by overcropping. Under the seignorial tenure,—a modified feudalism based on the Custom of Paris, that was not abolished till 1854,—the *habitant* carried on a ruinous system of tillage; first cutting down the bush, then scraping the surface of the ground with his Norman plough,—a clumsy wooden affair hung between a pair of wheels,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—and then sowing wheat year after year till the soil gave out, when he moved to another holding and repeated the process. Of rotation of crops, manuring, growing grass and turnips, he knew nothing till Scotch farmers came in after the British conquest.

The early colonists brought flower-seeds and apple-trees from France; and an apple known as the *Reinette du Canada* was produced: but, owing probably to climatic drawbacks, the taste for orchards and gardens has to some extent been lost. Dairy farming is handicapped by the long winter. On most farms, hay and potatoes are the staples; and the people complain of American duties on these as well as on their poultry, cattle, and peas. New England is the nearest, and, if it were free, would be the best, market for all their wares. As it is, they have to be content with Boston prices less duty, middleman's profit, and cost of transport, which in these days leaves little for their labor. The export of square timber has diminished, and the building of wooden ships—once an important industry—ceased; whilst the minerals and sea-fisheries cannot be turned to much account owing to taxation of the products at the United States frontier. It is safe to say that the richest State of the Union would suffer if, like Quebec, it were severed from the continental market by a double set of tariffs.

At one time the clergy endeavored to divert the stream of migration toward Manitoba. But it costs less to go to Lowell or Nashua; and factory work, at which the *habitant* and his large family make good wages, is preferred to raising forty-cent wheat in such high latitudes. The Dominion Parliament and Quebec Legislature have built a considerable railroad mileage in order to open up the Province;—perhaps also to bribe the people to stay at home;—but these local roads have, in fact, done something to swell the exodus, by supplying a ready means of getting across the frontier, as well as by bringing the *habitant* in contact with visitors from the United States.

In winter, committees are formed to prepare a list of those intending to emigrate, so that a special rate may be obtained from the railroads. When spring comes the trains are crowded with young and old bound for the land of promise. Others go in the fall, after the crops have been gathered, and return in the spring: these are known as the *hirondelles*. The village band accompanies the party to the railroad: the *curé* gets some to sign the pledge, and gives his blessing to all. *La fièvre des États-Unis* is so general that, as Father Lacasse, a distinguished Oblate, observes, "We are all asking in a whisper, 'What is going to become of the race? What is going to become of Canada?'"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In some parts churches have been closed because of the flight of so many people. Every parish contains abandoned farms. The *hirondelles*, on returning for the summer, describe in glowing terms what they have seen; telling in particular of "those of ours" who have won distinction in the professions or are making money in business.

The French-Canadian newspapers printed in New England circulate in Quebec; and Quebec papers devote space to New-England news. The Saint-Jean-Baptiste societies in both countries hold an annual convention,—sometimes in Canada, at other times in the United States,—at which topics affecting the welfare of the race are discussed. Aside from formal reunions of this sort, there is a constant ebb and flow of population across the frontier. The New-England French organize pilgrimages to the shrine of Saint Anne at Beaupré, and visit their old homes on returning: of late they have been getting up bicycle parties.

At rural postoffices most of the letters and newspapers are for or from New England. The letters from New England usually contain money; for, like the Irish emigrant, the French Canadian is deeply attached to his kindred, and counts no sacrifice on his part too great if only he can induce them to join him. When work is scarce in the States there is a backwash: but so soon as business revives the migration revives also; and it carries off the most active of both sexes. Lecky, writing of the emigration from Ireland in the eighteenth century, says:

"The removal from a nation of tens of thousands of the ablest and most energetic of its citizens must inevitably, by a mere physical law, result in the degradation of the race."

It is perhaps too soon to look for the effect of the migration upon the character of the French-Canadian race; but the injury to the material interests of the Province caused by the annual flight of the best is painfully apparent. The French-speaking population of Quebec numbers 1,200,000. According to the abstract of the census of 1890, the number of French Canadians and of persons of French-Canadian extraction in the United States is 840,000. Mr. Mercier predicts that in twenty years there would be more French Canadians by birth and descent in the United States than in Canada.

The French Canadian is remarkably prolific; marrying young, and having a patriarchal family. The difference in physique between the French of French Canada and the French of France has received some attention from a resident at Saint-Pierre-Miquelon, where five or six

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousand fishermen from the Channel ports of France gather every spring to fish on the Banks of Newfoundland. The French-Canadian fisherman is slightly taller than his Old-World kinsman, but not so fleshy. Measurements of fishermen from Saint Malo and of French-Canadian *Malouins* by descent give an average weight of 155 pounds to the former and 148 to the latter. The average height of the French Canadians is 5 feet $5\frac{3}{4}$ inches; of the Frenchmen, 5 feet $5\frac{1}{4}$ inches. The French Canadian has lost the ruddy complexion of the French *Malouin;* his feet are longer and narrower, his arms and legs longer, his features sharper; and the color of his hair and eyes is more uniformly dark. The physical variation, in short, is somewhat similar to that which distinguishes the people of New England from the people of Old England.

According to the Canadian census, the average number of persons in a family in purely French-speaking counties exceeds 6; *viz.*, in Bonaventure 6.2, Temiscouata 6.4, Gaspé 6.4, Charlevoix 6.7. This is the average found by the census-taker. The actual average is higher, however: for there is scarcely a farmhouse from the Ottawa River to the Gulf of St. Lawrence that has not sent children to the United States; and when they have been gone a year or more they are not included in the official count. The average in France is about 5. Various causes, such as the law of equal inheritance, are blamed for the falling off in France. In French Canada wild land can be had for nothing, and there is freedom of bequest. In the seventeenth century, Jean Poitras, a carpenter of Quebec, was the Priam of the colony with 25 children. Mr. Gédéon Ouimet, a recent superintendent of public instruction, was one of 26 children by the same father and mother. When the French Chamber appropriated a million francs to pay for the education of the seventh child of indigent parents, the Legislature of Quebec offered free land to parents with 12 or more living children; and a surprising number forwarded attested claims.

The fecundity may be due in part to the selection, in a Darwinian sense, of the original settlers. The voyage across the Atlantic in the small sailing vessels of the seventeenth century, usually with ship-fever as a fellow-passenger, together with the hardships incidental to pioneering in the forest amid the alarums and incursions of the Iroquois, weeded out the weak and sickly, for whom smallpox and *mal de terre*—a wasting scurvy supposed to be caused by exhalations from the virgin soil—also lay in wait. "Our survivors," wrote an official in 1650, "are to a man robust fellows and true *gens de cœur.*" On top of this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

natural selection Colbert introduced artificial selection by shipping girls chosen not for beauty so much as for vigor of body, who were met at the wharf at Quebec by settlers and married out of hand. The cargo of one vessel comprised one hundred and fifty girls, twelve mares, two stallions, and one hundred and fifty sheep, "all destined," wrote the minister, a master of detail, "to put stamina into the colony." Several hundred settlers obtained wives thus; including the men of the Carignan regiment which, fresh from fighting the Turks in Hungary, was sent out and disbanded in 1670–72. It is easy to believe with Colbert that the product of these marriages was, physically speaking, *une marchandise choisie.*

Emigration from France to Canada practically ceased about 1700. When the Intendant Talon begged him to send more settlers, Colbert answered that the King could not think of depopulating France to build up a colony; to which an ecclesiastic retorted, below his breath, that His Most Christian Majesty sacrificed more men in a single campaign than would suffice for half a dozen New Frances. At the census of 1695, the population was 14,000; and from this handful, selected in the manner described, the French-Canadian people have sprung. When England took possession in 1763, there were 65,000 souls between Gaspé and Detroit. Very few emigrants have come from France since. The *habitant* himself has multiplied till the race now numbers 1,300,000 in all Canada (exclusive of 100,000 Acadians in the seaboard provinces), and, counting American-born children of French-Canadian parents, more than 800,000 in the United States. Clerical writers used to maintain that this rapid increase was a miracle, of which the object was the firm planting of the Catholic religion in North America. Yet the increase has not been any more rapid, relatively, than that which took place in the Thirteen Colonies, where the religion was not Catholic. The same class of writers now affirm that the migration to New England is a special providence designed to bring Puritan New England to the Catholic faith. The Jesuit Hamon, whose book, "Les Canadiens-Français dans la Nouvelle-Angleterre" (Quebec, 1891), is well worth reading, is of this opinion. I have no means of knowing what effect the exodus is likely to have in that respect; but anyone acquainted with French Canada can see that intercourse with New England is changing the ideas and conceptions of the French-Canadian people in regard to many things. A Montreal newspaper scarcely exaggerates in saying that the change "already amounts to a revolution."

First and foremost, the clergy no longer dread American institutions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the War of Independence Monsignor Briand issued a fierce *mandement* against Americans. He pointed out that *la religion Bostonienne* was the form of Protestantism most inimical to the Catholic Church, her priests, altars, and saints; that its professors had reviled King George for passing the Quebec Act because of its generous treatment of the Church, and now, taking the French Canadians for dolts, were representing the Act to be a tyrannical measure and promising to abolish seigniorial dues and even tithes. The aim of these Puritans and Independents being, in short, to overthrow human and divine order, it followed that the *habitant* who sympathized with them was bound to land in monstrous heresies and to incur the wrath of God and his lawful sovereign. The Bishop had just received a pension from the Crown, over which the ballad-mongers made merry: but his detestation of republicanism was no doubt perfectly sincere; for, like all the bishops down to that time, he was a Frenchman from France, an aristocrat and believer in the divine right of kings,—British as well as Bourbon. The French Revolution, with its atheism, served to confirm the clergy in their hostility to the United States; and their loyalty to Britain waxed all the stronger when, in return for their services in 1776 and 1812, Britain granted the Church more extensive privileges than she had enjoyed under French rule. A *Te Deum* was sung for Trafalgar; the Sulpicians helped to erect a monument to Nelson in Montreal; in the Papineau insurrection of 1837 the last rites were refused to rebels in the field.

When the exodus began the bishops spoke bitterly of the United States; Americans being usually described as a nation of money-getters without respect for religion or authority. But the old prejudice has now wholly disappeared. According to Father Hamon, the French Canadians in New England and New York have built in twenty years one hundred and twenty churches and fifty convents, many of which are served by priests and nuns from Quebec, who get on better with their compatriots than Irish or German priests. The Sulpicians have built colleges at Baltimore, and elsewhere; the bishops attend conferences in the United States; French-Canadian priests collect money there for the erection of churches in Quebec; and American students of theology frequent the Montreal seminary and Laval.

The clergy are the natural leaders of the French-Canadian people. The first settlers came from what Colbert called the 'more religious provinces" of France;—Normandy, Brittany, Perche, Anjou, Poitou, and Saintonge;—and the colony was founded not to extend the French empire so much as the empire of Christianity. Nature herself, as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jesuit wrote, conspired to promote devotion,—"the savage Indians, the dark forests, the mighty lakes and rivers, the sense of complete isolation from home and kindred." Even the earthquakes which shook the valley of the St. Lawrence for weeks in 1663, though "bad for chimneys," were "un grand bien pour les âmes," the churches being crowded.

Popular government did not exist; there was no such institution as the town-meeting; there were few books and few able to read them. The people were thrown back, in a believing age, upon religion. The regular offices on the numerous days of obligation; processions for rain or against distemper; celebrations in honor of the parish saint; the "white mass" or prayer-meeting, when a priest was not on hand; entertaining the Récollets or begging friars; preparing for the confessional; baking the *pain bénit*[1]; pilgrimages to Saint Anne at Beaupré; and various special services—sometimes in churches so poorly constructed that in winter, notwithstanding pans of burning charcoal in the aisle, the altar wine froze—occupied much of the time they had to spare from the drudgery of the bush. If the clergy of France in those days were lax, the clergy of Canada were, and have always been, distinguished for purity of life, zeal, and self-sacrifice. While not free from the weaknesses of their caste, they are, as a body, men of exemplary bearing.

When England came on the scene it was natural that the people, no longer able to make a shadowy fetich of their king,—now of a different race and creed, and a conqueror to boot,—should bestow the whole of their affection upon the Catholic Church and its ministers, who had stood by them through dark days. The influence of the clergy is not so great as it was, but is still very considerable; and the fact that they are now reconciled to the exodus to the United States, and like to go there themselves, is doing a good deal to promote it.

The impression carried away by the summer tourist, that the French Canadian speaks a *patois*, is not well founded. He employs words and phrases not recognized by the Academy; but that is not altogether his fault. The first settlers had to invent a terminology for their new surroundings. They accepted the Indian names for some of

[1] The *pain bénit* was bread prepared by each family in turn, taken to the church, blessed by the *curé*, distributed among the congregation, and carried home. On receiving it from the priest they used to pray :—

"Pain-bénit, je te prends—
Si je meurs subitement,
Sers moi de sacrament."

This pious custom is dying out.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the strange birds, fishes, and fruits. In other cases there was nothing for it but to coin words; for what did the French of France know of sleighing, canoeing, snow-shoeing, portaging, clearing land, barn-raising, driving logs, or making maple sugar? In the Lower parishes the *habitant* gets married "at the herring," baptizes his child "at the capelan," does something else at the "squid"; the seasons when the fish "run," *i. e.*, strike the shore to spawn, being as important in his reckoning as are the *vendanges* to the peasant of France. Some of his phrases date from his struggles with the Iroquois; thus he speaks of going to the "fort" when he means the village,—the first villages having been provided with stockades,—and, to frighten a naughty child, he threatens to call in *les sauvages*. He has preserved a number of words that were good French in the seventeenth century, but have since changed their meaning or gone out of use in France. He also employs sailor phrases in an odd way,—as when he "moors" his horse to his sleigh, and "disembarks" from that vehicle with his "dunnage." Taking it altogether, however, his French is better than that of the French peasant of to-day. The worst that can be said of it is that it is archaic by comparison. His pronunciation of *t* and *d* is marked by a nasal twang; due, possibly, to the climatic agencies that are supposed by some to be responsible for the twang of the down-east Yankee. The educated French Canadian speaks as good French, of course, as the educated Parisian; but he uses fewer gestures.

Till the exodus made it a matter of self-interest to learn English, the *habitants* were averse to doing so. They had an idea, to which color was given by the Canadian constitution of 1841, that the Government wanted to transform them into Englishmen and Protestants. With the English-speaking Canadians in Ontario and the seaboard provinces they are united politically: but the union is an uneasy one; and they have jealously maintained their language, religion, and laws. If they are learning English now, it is not because they desire to establish more intimate relations with the English provinces, so much as because it is a help to them when they go to New England.

Arthur Buies tells of a text-book on agricultural chemistry having been condemned by the ecclesiastical censor on the ground that it contained nothing about the Virgin Mary. What he means is that in the schools everything has hitherto been subordinated to religious instruction. The rural schools, taught by nuns, Brothers, and badly paid lay-teachers, are mere nurseries for preparing the child for First Communion. The public schools are Catholic schools regulated by a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

council composed of the bishops and an equal number of laymen. The English minority of the Province is allowed separate schools, which are undenominational. In the Province of Ontario, the case is reversed: the Catholic minority enjoys state-aided separate schools; whilst the public schools of the non-Catholic majority are undenominational.

In 1824 the Seminary of Quebec reported that one-fourth of the rural population could read; whilst one-tenth could "write their names, some badly enough." Some years afterward, when the British Government began to encourage primary education,—which the clergy had so sadly neglected,—an act had to be passed empowering school trustees to sign their names with a cross. According to the last census 15 per cent of the population is unable to read, and 18 per cent unable to write. There is a growing demand that less time should be devoted to catechism and more to English and the three R's. "New England," says a prominent school reformer, "is the future home of a large proportion of our people: at present we go there without any knowledge of English, and are handicapped. Let us teach that language properly to every boy and girl, so that they shall not be aliens out-and-out when they cross the frontier." Others advocate the removal of the schools from clerical control; but that, I suspect, is a long way off.

New-England influence is largely responsible for what Ultramontanes call the "New-England spirit,"—hostility to the exorbitant pretensions of the Ultramontane clergy, and particularly to their interference in elections. The early bishops not only harangued the people on religious topics and such stock subjects as card-playing, dancing after sundown, Sabbath-breaking, loudness in dress, usury, fortune-telling, resorting to magic and abracadabras, etc., but dictated to and advised them in all affairs of importance. What with the paternal edicts of the civil, and the *mandements* of the spiritual, arm, the colonists were regulated "down to the end of their nails."

The Ultramontanes, who made their appearance forty years ago, took it for granted that the people were as amenable to clerical rule in the nineteenth century as they had been in the seventeenth; that in the interval they had not grown in intellectual stature. In defining the prerogatives of the Church they went farther than the first bishops —ecclesiastics of the Gallican type—had cared or dared to go. The Church, they said, is, from her divine origin, superior to the state, and paramount in all matters falling under the head of faith and morals,—that is to say, within a sphere to which nobody but herself has a right to set limits. It follows that she is entitled, nay, bound, to interfere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in politics whenever, in her judgment, faith and morals are at stake,—in other words, whenever she pleases.

The Dominion Election Act contains a clause, copied from the English statutes, voiding parliamentary elections at which undue spiritual influence has been exercised. It is "undue influence" when the priest threatens to withhold the sacraments from a voter and his family if they vote the Liberal ticket, or when from the pulpit or altar he consigns the Liberal party to hell-fire. When they were called to account for these practices the Ultramontanes replied that Parliament had exceeded its powers in restraining the clergy from acting as they saw fit at elections; that it was neither more nor less than putting the state above the Church. In a judgment read by Cardinal Taschereau's brother, the Supreme Court of Canada made short work of that defence. An attempt to form a Centre or Catholic party in Parliament, with the bishops directing its policy, was defeated by the opposition of the Liberals, headed by Mr. Laurier, now Premier of the Dominion. At the recent general election, at which the Manitoba school question was the issue, the bishops published a joint *mandement* in favor of the reëstablishment of the separate schools, but did not declare openly against Mr. Laurier, who had just voted against a bill, introduced by Sir Charles Tupper, over-riding the legislation of Manitoba and restoring the schools by Federal enactment. The older clergy, however, "made it hot" for Mr. Laurier in the rural districts. The younger clergy were friendly, as friendly as they could be under the circumstances; and, thanks to their quiet sympathy and to the New-England spirit amongst the electors,—who, besides, desired to see a French Canadian at the head of affairs,—Mr. Laurier carried the Province by two to one. French-Canadian newspapers published in New England were circulated as Liberal literature; and New-England French Canadians, some of American birth, took the stump for Liberal candidates. "New England," cries a despairing Ultramontane pulpit orator, "has precipitated a revolution, has filled the land with all the plagues condemned by the Syllabus." However that may be, New England must henceforth be reckoned with in Canadian politics. For obvious reasons its influence will be greater than that of Irish Americans in the affairs of Ireland.

The Church in Quebec is empowered by law to collect tithes and *fabrique* assessments. The tithe is every twenty-sixth bushel of the cereal crops, deliverable cleaned, threshed, and winnowed, at the *presbytère* or manse on or before Easter. Of late, tithes have been collected from hay, and a "supplementary" or cash tithe from the inhabitants of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

towns and villages. The *fabrique* assessment is a *pro-rata* tax levied on farms for the construction and repair of churches and *presbytères*. When the priest gets a majority of the Catholic freeholders in his parish to petition for a new church the bishop appoints commissioners to assess the rate and do the work. Neither tithes nor *fabrique* taxes are paid by Protestants. The tithe is not a heavy charge, and under the voluntary system the people would probably pay as much; but the *fabrique* tax becomes a grinding impost when the bishop creates new parishes by subdividing old ones and insists on replacing wooden churches with fine stone edifices.

The exemption of ecclesiastical property from taxation is also a serious matter in a poor community where the Church and the religious Orders, of which there are about sixty, possess so much. In some parishes the value of the exempt property exceeds that of the taxable. The depression of agriculture is giving rise to an agitation for the abolition of *fabrique* taxes and exemptions, and for the secularization of the clerical estates,—reforms demanded in vain by the Liberals fifty years ago. "Hell," writes Father Lacasse on behalf of the clergy, "awaits those who refuse to bear these divinely ordained burdens." "Our friends in New England," the reformers answer, "are not called upon to pay them, yet God blesses them above us. How do you account for that?"

The influence of New England is seen in other things. The clergy still keep an eye on the newspapers, and ban and boycott them when they go too far; but I do not think they would now venture to ban a literary society and refuse Christian burial to one of its members, as they did with Guibord five-and-twenty years ago. Everyone, even to the *curé*, is beginning to have his doubts about the miracles reported at Beaupré. No doubt Saint Anne did work miracles there in the early days; but it is different now. To do them justice, the priests in charge of the shrine are reducing the strain on one's powers of belief as honest inability to believe increases. Formerly, cures of cancer, paralysis, and blindness were of everyday occurrence. Now, the recovery of lost money and friends, the cure of hysteria in girls, and the conversion of Protestant husbands by Catholic wives are about the only wonders one hears of; and the official reporter goes out of his way to allow that, after all, natural causes may have been operative. It cannot be said, however, that the fading of the robust faith of the *habitant* is accompanied by greater worldly happiness.

Nor is contact with New England improving the manners of this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peuple de gentilshommes. Along the frontier they are less polite than they used to be and more self-opinionated; but without doubt they have gained more than they have lost. They make good American citizens; for they have many excellent qualities. They are quick at learning, frugal, industrious, and, from having been thrown on their own resources, are capable of turning their hands to anything and of doing it pretty well. Those who picture the *habitant* as a mere troglodyte like the French peasant of Zola do him rank injustice.

As for the political changes which the exodus is likely to bring about, the general opinion of French Canadians who think about the matter at all is that some day it must lead to the union of Canada with the United States. The exodus from English-speaking Canada is proportionately just as great. But Quebec is not bound to England by any sentimental ties; and the force of attraction exerted by the United States meets with much less resistance there than in the other provinces. Long after the British flag had superseded the French flag on the rock of Quebec, the people on the south shore used to look across the river and mutter, "Nous reverrons pourtant nos bonnes gens." That dream has gone, though a warm affection for France remains.

Except the want of free access to the American market, the *habitant* has nothing to complain of under British rule: all the same he is British only in name. On public holidays, when the Union Jack is flying in the English provinces, he hoists the Tricolor, and lately has taken to placing the Stars and Stripes just below it. He is opposed to the Imperial Federation idea, and at the recent election voted against Mr. Chamberlain's imperial zollverein project because he regarded it as a step toward closer union with England and the Old World. Sensible Englishmen can hardly believe that he could be coaxed into fighting England's battles abroad,—perhaps against his mother country,—still less into taking up arms against his relatives in New England, because England had fallen foul of the United States in Venezuela. It may be well, however, to repeat that political union with the United States is seldom discussed among French Canadians. The race is now astride the boundary line; and the forces of nature are making for its reunion under one flag: but nature takes her time about such matters.

EDWD. FARRER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRANCE AS A FIELD FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.

THERE is no centre of learning more richly supplied than Paris with schools and faculties for advanced instruction in nearly every department of learning and research; and there is no country more ready than France to open the doors of its educational institutions to foreign students. That intellectual sympathy of France with America which dates from the residence of Franklin in Paris has never died out, and is now cherished by leading Frenchmen to an extent which insures a warm welcome to the visiting American. Yet, while our students have been flocking to Germany by thousands, comparatively few have availed themselves of the advantages for pursuing liberal studies which France has to offer them. The subject has been recently discussed by eminent educators both in France and this country; and there is reason to believe that in the reorganization of the University of France, which is now going on, the desirability of making that and similar institutions attractive to the foreign student will not be lost sight of.

Why American students have in the past preferred Germany to France may be seen by a glance at the higher educational system of that country. The German university is a well-understood and well-defined organization, of which the workings, so far as they concern the student, are familiar to all interested in them. In the student's progress there is a well-defined point at which he may seek admission to the university, and an equally well-defined goal for which he is to strive. One who has gained the degree of Bachelor of Arts at any of our better American colleges, is more than qualified to enter upon the course; and, by good work, he may fairly expect to obtain his degree within three years. His necessary studies during that time are easily ascertained and mapped out; he terminates his course by an examination; and demonstrates his fitness to become an active citizen in the republic of letters by writing an original thesis on his chosen subject. This production is expected to show merit on the part of the author as an original investigator, while, at the same time, the requirements are not beyond the powers of a young man of fair talent, application, and industry. When all the requirements are satisfied, the de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gree of Doctor of Philosophy, or Doctor of Medicine, as the case may be, is the official certificate of his success; and its significance is everywhere known and recognized.

Social life at a German university is extremely attractive; and the occasional presence of young gentlemen who attend more for the society of their fellow-students than for purposes of learning, adds to its charm without necessarily distracting the serious student. All the arrangements have, by long trial and experience, been so adjusted as to strike the happiest mean between conditions too easy to imply merit and too difficult to be hopefully encountered.

So different are the conditions in France, that it is scarcely possible to say whether any such system does or does not exist there. The facilities for study are unrivalled. There are faculties of science, letters, law, and medicine, whose reputation is as wide as the world. A combination of these faculties in one city is frequently called a university. These faculties are far from including in their scope all that France has to offer to a foreign student. The latter has so wide a choice of schools, teachers, and laboratories that he may find it hard to select from so rich an assortment. But, notwithstanding this wealth of choice, it is difficult for the foreign visitor or student to recognize any such well-defined system as that seen in a German university. It is a curious fact that while the great movement which introduced the modern régime into France organized and unified all other departments of its public activity, including the system of elementary and secondary education, it seems, so far, to have done little toward moulding the ancient foundations of learning into a unified whole. Still more indefinite is the academic degree for which the student has to strive. It is true that the *Baccalauréat* is a general degree, of which the conditions are readily understood. But, being the most elementary degree, bestowed at the close of the secondary course in the Lycée, it is not one for which a foreigner need strive. After the Frenchman who has taken his *Baccalauréat* has completed a three-year course at an advanced institution he may come forth as a *Licencié*, an *Agrégé*, an *Ancien Élève*, an *Élève breveté*, an *Archiviste paléographe*, and may, quite possibly, secure one of several other equally indefinite designations. Ultimately he may become a Doctor of Science, or Doctor of Letters, on conditions which I shall hereafter mention. It is now contemplated to provide for a general University Doctorate corresponding to that of Philosophy in Germany and the United States; but, in the past, no such degree has been attainable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The question of the advantages which France offers to the American student has recently excited so much interest, and the present writer has been so frequently asked for information on the subject, that he proposes, in the present article, to make a brief statement thereupon. He can have little to say about the purely professional schools; not only for the very good reason that he knows little about them, but because their crowded condition is now rendering it necessary to impose restrictions on admission to them. Of these schools the most renowned has been that of medicine. During the last few years there has been such an unprecedented influx of foreign students to this school, that restrictive measures became absolutely necessary. These measures were rendered the more urgent from the fact that large numbers of the visitors settled in France and competed with the already underpaid native physicians. It is therefore not to be expected that foreign students will find it so easy to gain admission to this school in the future as it has been in the past; indeed it is quite likely that they may find it impossible.

While the same is not strictly true of the schools of art, yet their celebrity also attracts foreign students in such numbers that some restrictive measures can scarcely fail to be necessary in the near future.

Leaving out of consideration these professional schools, and also such institutions as the École Polytechnique and École Normale Supérieure, —which are intended exclusively for French aspirants to the public service,—the visiting student still has a wide choice from the best that the French capital can afford. The special schools which may attract him are too varied and numerous to be even mentioned. I shall therefore confine myself to the three great foundations of liberal education.

First among these, we have the ancient and renowned University of Paris—more familiarly known as the Sorbonne. The latter is no longer the debating ground for the great questions of theology, it having been invaded and conquered by the faculties of science and letters. The building erected by Richelieu has, during the past ten years, been gradually replaced by another, which, when completed, will be the most magnificent temple ever erected to the cause of education. The cost of this structure has already gone far into the millions; and millions more will doubtless be expended before it is complete. The courses are divided into two sets; viz., those open to all comers, and those which require an enrolment or *inscription*. It should please the visitor to know that the former include instruction by the full profes-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sors; so that the student cannot, under any circumstances, find difficulty in hearing the greatest men of France,—unless indeed the mere number of those seeking the privilege should exceed the available accommodations. However this may be in the department of letters, there is not much danger of its occurring in that of exact science. A visit paid by the writer to the lecture-room of the leading professor of mathematics showed the presence of less than a score of auditors, a few of whom were women.

The Sorbonne is by no means satisfied with simply allowing its students to listen to courses of lectures. It therefore provides, on a large scale, a system of *conférences* or *cours fermés*, which are designed to drill the student in special problems and questions, as well as for explaining and developing in detail those subjects which the professor cannot fully dwell upon in his regular course. The instruction here is given mostly by assistant professors; but it must not be inferred from this title that they are tyros in science. In the department of mathematics, the teachers at the Sorbonne include men who, in addition to holding a very high rank among the mathematicians of the world, have displayed that force and elegance in treating their subject which has long been a feature of French science, and who have prepared text-books unequalled for clearness and precision. Heretofore, admission to these courses has been mostly confined to holders of the French *Baccalauréat;* but there is no regulation absolutely requiring this qualification. If any American student who has taken his Bachelor's degree wishes to enroll himself at the Sorbonne as a student, he will experience no difficulty except that arising from the increasing numbers who flock thither for instruction. At a *conférence* at which the writer was present, the number attending was so great that any individual must have felt himself somewhat at a disadvantage.

Next in age and dignity to the Sorbonne comes the Collége de France, situated in its immediate neighborhood. This institution dates from the time of Francis I, who was led to found it in consequence of the failure of the University to give that attention to Oriental subjects, and especially Greek and Hebrew, which he thought they fairly demanded. Thus, from the beginning, Oriental and general philology has been one of the specialties of the institution. The Collége occupies a field almost as wide as that of the Sorbonne; covering, in fact, special subjects which the latter scarcely touches. The range at the student's choice extends from the discourses of Levasseur on the economic conditions of various countries, and the advanced mathematics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Jordan, in one direction, to the investigations of the leading physiologists and anatomists of France in another. Here, as at the Sorbonne, the instruction is free to all; being limited only by the numbers who seek admission to the more popular courses.

The third great foundation is the École Pratique des Hautes Études. This school is, so far as the writer knows, a quite unique organization. It is of recent origin; dating from the second Empire. The object in view was to utilize those facilities afforded by the Capital for instruction and research which had, until that time, been neglected. Its organization may be said to be almost unhampered by conditions. Its work is divided into five branches, each directed by an administrative commission of five members. Any person eminent in any branch of knowledge, and desiring to teach young men how to study and investigate, may become a member of the faculty. Any youth desiring to learn and investigate may enroll himself in the school without money and without price, on the single condition that he is able to avail himself of the advantages offered him. The institution has no local habitation. Wherever in Paris there is a laboratory at the command of a professor, there may teacher and students assemble: wherever there is a room, there may the professor be heard. Much of the instruction is given at the Sorbonne; and probably more will be given when the latter is completed: but the greater part of it is scattered over the innumerable scientific institutions of the Capital. The primary object is to make the student an investigator by the actual practice of investigation, under the direction of his professor.

Neither this school nor the Collége de France confers degrees. From the very nature of their constitution they do not offer a well-defined curriculum having a beginning and an end. The conferring of academic degrees is the especial function of the University. Here the only degrees for which the American student is likely to be an aspirant are the Licentiate and the Doctorate. The regulations governing these honors differ so much from those with which we are familiar in this country and in Germany, that some explanation is necessary.

The student is supposed to enter the University after taking his *Baccalauréat;* as he does in Germany after completing his course at the Gymnasium, or in this country after having become a Bachelor of Arts. But the system of combining the secondary and higher education is more symmetrical and logical in both France and Germany than it is in England and America. In the former countries a sharp line is drawn between the general liberal training at the Lycée and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gymnasium—which may be supposed to terminate about the age of eighteen—and the subsequent work at the University. The completion of the former, in France at least, is marked by the Bachelor's degree. The corresponding sharp line in our own country is found only between the high school and the college. But our scholars do not leave the high school with the degree of Bachelor; on the contrary, they have a four-year course at college before receiving it. Moreover, the advanced or university courses, in our leading educational institutions, have been partially grafted upon and combined with the college courses. Thus it happens that what at Harvard and elsewhere are regarded as courses preparatory to the Bachelor's degree become, in France and Germany, studies preparatory to the Licentiate, or the Doctorate. The result of this is that in France the Licentiate may be won by courses little more advanced in the special subjects chosen by the student than those which have been taken by the Bachelor of Arts leaving Harvard or Johns Hopkins.

The Doctor's degree in science or letters is also awarded on terms radically different from those of the German or American university. Residence at the University is not obligatory after the Licentiate has been taken. No examination is required, except such as may be implied in the defence of a thesis. The latter is wholly different from the thesis of the German or American student, as regards the amount of research and maturity of work expected of it. Instead of being the first essay of the beginner in original investigation, it is expected to show the mature hand of a master. Instead of being a thin pamphlet, it is either a goodly volume, or a memoir of such a character that it would be accepted by a learned society for its transactions. It is therefore said, and doubtless with justice, that the Doctor's degree is much more difficult of attainment at the Sorbonne than in Germany.

The proposed new University Doctorate may materially change these conditions; but the problem of adapting it to the French system is not without difficulty. How it will be grappled with will doubtless appear when all the facilities of the new Sorbonne are at the command of the student.

The question whether our students should at once transfer their preference in respect of higher education from Germany to France, is one not easy to answer. The fact is that no American student need now go abroad to complete his education, unless in very exceptional cases. The development of our own universities during the past twenty years has been such that he can find as good instruction at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

home as abroad. The purpose of a residence abroad is not to acquire an education unattainable at home, but to afford the student that breadth of culture which is gained only by residence in a country different from his own, and by intercourse with the masters of learning in other lands. These ends, it appears to me, can be as well gained by the student in France as in any other country; and he will receive a warm welcome when it is once known that he appreciates it. An attempt has been made to form special organizations for his benefit which, though they may not be wholly successful, are none the less worthy of appreciation,—especially as evincing the feeling entertained by Frenchmen for our own country.

If it be true that the Frenchman does not possess the art of making a foreign visitor feel at home, it is because he aims at so high a standard of hospitality that it cannot be extended to all the world, nor kept up as a daily practice. This, it may be expected, he will remedy when he finds that the foreign visitor expects nothing of the kind, but desires only a friendly welcome, and intercourse without ceremony or display.

SIMON NEWCOMB.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EMPEROR WILLIAM II.

WHEN the Columbus quadricentennial was celebrated in Chicago, the Emperor William was the only monarch who took notice of that memorable event. His telegram to the President ran as follows: "The German Emperor sends you, through the German Minister, his sincere congratulations on the occasion of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America, and couples with the same his hearty good wishes for the further prosperity of the great country of which you are the head."

The Emperor's good-will toward the mighty republic beyond the ocean had been of long standing, as he himself said to the American Ambassador in Berlin, Mr. Phelps, on the occasion of his presenting his credentials in September, 1889. His words were:—

"From my youth up I have had a great admiration for the great and rising community which you are here called on to represent; and the study of its history in peace and war has always been of the greatest interest to me. Among the many high qualities which your countrymen possess, it is their spirit of enterprise, their love of order, and their talent for invention which draw the attention of the whole world to them. Germans find themselves all the more attracted by the people of the United States, in that they are closely connected with the North Americans by the many ties which go side by side with community of blood. The ruling sentiment of the two peoples is that of kinship and proved friendship; and the future can only add to the cordiality of our relations."

This address to Mr. Phelps and the telegram above quoted are characteristic of William II. However one may judge him, he, of all living monarchs, excites the most attention and the most lively interest. He is the typical modern ruler, the child of his age. With great and lofty aims in view, he does his best to fall in with the demands of the day. That he constantly re-excites this interest and attention is due in the first place to his strongly marked personality. "Personality is the greatest good fortune that can befall the sons of men," says Goethe somewhere; and this good fortune has fallen to the lot of Germany's present ruler. The Emperor William feels himself strong in himself; he has a strong will and a strong hand; he possesses the consciousness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of wishing to do right and of being able to do so, and is convinced that he is able worthily to fill the high place to which Providence has called him. His sense of duty is unshakable; he gives a strict account of his doings to himself; and if at times, in the overflowing consciousness of youth and strength, he enters upon a wrong course, as soon as he sees that the majority of his people is not in accord with him, he retraces his steps and takes the right one. For he is quick to perceive this fact; and however strong the influence of the moment is within him, and however strong the impulse which at times urges him to give rapid effect to his feelings, yet he never forgets his responsibility. He realizes at the right moment that millions of eyes are bent on him, now in high hope, now in anxiety, and now again in warning.

With this grave and resolute nature he combines another—deeply religious, sensitive, and romantic. The "Kingship by the grace of God" is no empty phrase to him. He is steeped to the last fibre of his being in the consciousness of the responsibility of his position; and nothing could induce him to believe this to be the result of an "accident of birth." The will of the Almighty has called him to it; and a sense of this gives him, in an increased degree, the power to act with confidence and to avoid all hesitation and indecision.

The fear which was felt at first, that he would prove to be strictly orthodox and throw himself into the arms of the orthodox party, has not, to the great relief of the best men among his people, been realized. He has too high a respect for religion to attach himself to any party on such grounds; and any attempts—of which there were not a few—to thus gain him over, were rudely repulsed, and only did harm to those who made them. His careful solicitude for ecclesiastical buildings in Berlin has often made people—chiefly in the provinces—shake their heads over him; but those people did not know that in Berlin there has been for many years a great deficiency of such buildings, and that the churches have been constantly overcrowded.

The sincere piety of the Emperor shows the spiritual side of his nature: it is closely bound up with the belief in his destiny, and forms a contrast with his, in other respects, practical views of life. What the Orientals call "fate" is to him a dispensation of Providence, and a sign of the pleasure of God.

This unshakable confidence in the authority reposed in him by a Higher Power gives the Emperor his astonishing elasticity: it enables him to easily overcome disappointments, and fills him with ever-fresh exultation in the execution of a difficult task. He has certainly had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disappointments enough; and the golden burden of the crown must often have lain heavy on his head.

Let us try to realize the circumstances under which he came to the throne, and the reception his personality and his method of government met with. There is no doubt that as the successor of William I and Frederick III he was regarded with confidence; but this feeling partook more or less of a historical nature. Personally but little was known about him, except that he had had an excellent civil and military education, and that he was heart and soul a soldier. He had scarcely ever taken part in public business; and, at the few state occasions on which he had appeared, he showed himself distant, retiring, and, to use a Prussian phrase, "buttoned up in his uniform." He had never made any disguise of his admiration for Prince Bismarck; having often visited the Chancellor unofficially of an evening, and listened for hours attentively to his talk and maxims. What the Prince thought of the then heir to the throne, and his probable course of action when he should succeed to it, was contained in the prophetic dictum, "He will one day be his own chancellor."

People who had come in contact with the Crown Prince at court and had had opportunities of observing him closely agreed with this judgment, and spoke highly of his zeal and industry in applying himself to and carrying out the varied tasks set him. Especial stress was laid on a criticism of the Prince which appeared in a pamphlet entitled "Court and Society in Berlin." This pamphlet, written by Count Paul Vasili (a M. de Moudion, *alias* Foucault), was published in 1884, and was immediately suppressed in Germany. It was consequently read all the more eagerly by the higher classes. It proved so correct in its more important points, that I quote it here at length:—

"Prince William is just four-and-twenty, so that it is hard to say how he will turn out. He is undoubtedly a young man with a future, and has wit, intelligence, and pluck. He is the cleverest of the royal princes, and is courageous, enterprising, ambitious, hot-headed but warm-hearted, most sympathetic; he has 'go,' fire, and mobility in character and mind, readiness in intercourse, and this to such an extent that one might almost fancy he was not a German. He is enthusiastically fond of the army, and is in turn much beloved by it. In spite of his youth, he has known how to make himself popular with all classes of society. He is well taught, has read much, forms plans for the prosperity of his country, and has remarkable understanding for everything connected with policy. He will certainly be a man of mark, and probably a great monarch. Prussia will perhaps find in him another Frederick the Great, but without that ruler's scepticism; besides which he possesses a sprightliness of character that will soften down the touches of harshness which will belong to him as a true Hohenzollern. He will be above all a personal monarch, and will not allow himself to be led;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he will have a sound and temperate judgment, a quick decision, a firm will, and energetic action. If he comes to the throne, he will carry on the work of his grandfather, and will certainly undo that of his father, whatever it may be. The enemies of Germany will find in him an adversary to be feared; and he may well prove the Henry IV of his country."

Such was the judgment of a Frenchman who hated Germany, and which it is doubly interesting to recall now. It was destined, at least in all material points, to be more quickly proved correct than anyone expected. After being heir to the throne for little more than three months, the Prince succeeded to it as William II. He found a new day come, and herculean tasks suddenly set before him. A whole age was buried in the grave with William I; a new era in the development of Prussia and Germany had begun; the most important questions awaited decision; unexpected desires were proclaimed; hopes that had never before been suspected looked for realization; a mighty shock seemed to pass through the nation, which felt that many things had become unstable which before had been held to be firm as a rock.

The last period of the rule of William I had been a quiet and secure one. At times there were dull growls of discontent from the industrial quarters of Berlin and the industrial towns in the provinces; but these were as distant thunder, and the person and throne of the venerable patriarch among the rulers of the world were undisturbed by them. The consciousness of security, of possessing a charm against all evils, so long as the gray-haired emperor ruled, was universal.

Then came the great reaction, when the Emperor Frederick too had bowed his weary head in eternal slumber. A young and, as was generally believed, a wholly inexperienced ruler had ascended the throne; in a thousand places sedition seethed and bubbled; the person of the Emperor became the sport of conflicting opinions; every utterance of his was repeated, mostly in a garbled form; parties crowded about him right and left, endeavoring to gain him over to their private interests, and to share in his authority; new counsellors were to be forced on him; there was no end to the intrigues; and, overtopping all in importance and weight, the social question raised its threatening head, and with resonant voice demanded satisfaction of its claims.

True, the iron chancellor, Prince Bismarck, stood at the young monarch's side; but, in addition to the fact that he was often in weak health, and retired into private life at Friedrichsruh or Varzin, it soon became clear, to those who were able to judge, that the two could not long go on governing together. It was felt that it could not be long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the fiery, restless, resolute Emperor found the influence of the Chancellor—who was 75 years old—an intolerable burden, and would shake himself free from it. That this would happen so quickly and in such an unexpected way as it did, no one could have foreseen; nor that the breach would be so complete, and that social reforms would be made the pretext for it.

"Above all, I shall (in the spirit of my grandfather) continue to aim at making imperial legislation tend to the further protection of the working-classes; a protection which the principles of Christian morality bid us give, as far as may be, to the poor and needy in the struggle for life. I hope that in this way it will be possible to counteract, to a great degree, unsound social principles; and I am convinced that in my efforts on behalf of our domestic prosperity I shall have the unanimous support of all true partisans of the Crown and of the Federated Governments without distinction of party."

By such words did the Emperor, at the first opening of the Reichstag, in June, 1888, make it known that the protection of the poor and oppressed was to be one of his chief cares as a ruler, and that he too was a representative of empire based on social principles.

Under William I the Artisans' Savings Law had been enacted, securing millions of Germans against poverty during sickness, accident, and in old age. This was a measure of vast importance; and it excited the admiration of other states, particularly on account of the rapidity with which it had been passed. That it laid many burdens on the industrial and mechanical classes and caused them many new difficulties was unavoidable; and Prince Bismarck wished for a pause in social legislation. But this did not agree with the intentions of the Emperor. He wished to extend the protection of the working-classes still further; and the great strike of miners in the Rhine country and in Westphalia, in the spring of 1889, furnished him with a pretext for interfering actively in the affairs of those classes. The Emperor also acted as mediator. At an audience given to the mine-owners he said :—

"I desire to recommend to all concerned to keep as far as possible in touch with the workmen. It is quite natural that everyone should try to get as much of the means of life as possible. The workmen read the newspapers and know what proportion their pay bears to the profits of the companies that employ them. It is not to be wondered at that they should wish to have a certain share in those profits."

From that time the Emperor never allowed the question of provision for artisans to rest. He was constantly mentioning it in the Staatsrath; he expressed in detail his views as to a day of rest on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sunday, and as to fixed hours of labor; he discussed the protection of women and children; and since, if Germany legislated alone on the matter, its industries might suffer heavy loss, he proposed an agreement between the principal industrial states, and invited an international conference on the subject at Berlin. Before it could meet, however, Prince Bismarck resigned and retired in dudgeon to Friedrichsruh.

Undaunted the Emperor pursued the path he had entered on. The Sunday day of rest was introduced; the Government workshops became models as regards provision for the workmen; the hours of labor for women and children were reduced; in connection with several of the royal mines and railways committees of workmen were formed; and on May 7, 1891, the sweeping laws for the protection of artisans were adopted by the Diet. The Emperor had good reason for saying, when inspecting the Krupp factories at Essen, "German workmen! You know that our House has always cared for the working-classes. I have shown the world the way in which I mean to go; and I say again to-day that I shall continue in that way."

If the Emperor showed that the lot of those of his subjects who had to earn their living by manual labor was a matter of especial interest to him, yet he also left no room for doubt that he was determined to repress with iron severity all attempts at disorder. His firm and manly behavior contributed much to the reassuring of the public mind in Germany; for, during the early portion of his reign, the bugbear of democracy had caused much alarm. If people had before believed that in many cases—not only abroad but in Germany—the social question could be solved only by "blood and iron," and that a civil war was inevitable within a short time, they now came to think quite differently, and to judge social-democratic affairs much more dispassionately, because they looked at them less from the political than from the social and economical point of view; in this way trying to bring about a peaceful solution.

That, in spite of all such efforts and the care of the Government for the working-classes,—which is greater than in any other country whatever,—socialism is steadily on the increase in Germany, and that at the last elections the number of Deputies representing the Social Democrats increased from 36 to 44, is not a matter of astonishment to those acquainted with the facts. Discontent is general, not only in Germany but elsewhere; and it finds free vent on German soil in universal suffrage. However, of the 1,323,000 votes cast in its favor at the last election, scarcely a twentieth part can be considered as given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Social Democrats who are such from conviction, and who would be ready, if necessary, to stand by their principles in action.

The other parties, especially that of the greater *bourgeoisie*, are not a little to blame for this enormous increase in Social Democracy. That class is still sunk in a deep political slumber, and even to-day is accurately portrayed in the caricature of "German Michael," with his night-cap pulled down over his ears, indifferent to all about him. If this *bourgeoisie*, which forms the sound nucleus of the German people, would rouse itself, and endeavor to support a safe national policy such as the Emperor would approve, the state of parties in Germany would be much improved, and the Government would at least know on whom it could depend. It really seems as if there must be storms from without or within before these millions of citizens, who can talk so wisely over their beer, and criticize so keenly, can be brought to realize that they would be doing a patriotic act in forming a powerful party which should not be at the mercy of any special principles. Ah those special objects of all kinds!—How they worried the Emperor, in spite of the fact that he had declared plainly enough, in a speech which attracted much attention, that no class could claim to be favored at the expense of others, and that it was the business of the Sovereign to weigh the interests of all classes against each other, and to see that the general interest of the whole country was not endangered! That is the only interest which the Emperor always has in view. It is his guide in choosing men to fill responsible posts in the government, and enables him to avoid the charge of selecting his advisers purely from personal considerations.

That mistakes in selection sometimes occur is natural enough; but if the Emperor sees that the men he has chosen are serving interests other than those which he has in view, or are at variance with the aims of the majority of his people, he dismisses them ruthlessly. "The Emperor has a man ready to take the place of every one of us," a Prussian minister once declared; and the remark was eminently true as characteristic of the Emperor's way of governing. He does not wish to be influenced in his decisions by elements which it is impossible for him always to control. He has quite broken with the famous dictum, "Le roi règne, mais il ne gouverne pas." Perhaps he is the first ruler to govern personally and yet uphold the principles of the constitution; thus welding together the old and new methods of government. There may be risks about such a course; but it has its advantages, especially where a firm and self-reliant character is con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cerned. If William II were not such a man, he would have long since lost heart, and adopted the much more convenient, safe, and unexciting method of governing through chancellors and ministers, which seems inseparable from monarchies with traditions, and which may end by endangering their apparently firmly based prosperity.

But fears about the future are not compatible with such qualities as the Emperor possesses; and, besides, he has a much too soldierlike nature to be afraid of anything,—god-fearing, resolute, and daring as he is. The motto that he wrote under his own portrait which he presented to a clergyman of merit, "He who trusts only in God and stands firm, has not built on the sand," came from his very soul. William II is a soldier through and through; and the first proclamation that he issued after ascending the throne was addressed to the army, which, to him, is the incarnation of the flower of his people. It ran, "We belong to each other, the army and I; we were made for each other; and will hold together unfailingly, if God so please, whether he sends us peace or war." He is not a soldier by tradition, as his father was, but of his own choice and conviction, like his grandfather. From an early age he trained himself in all kinds of sport; was a skilled fencer and a bold rider, heading his squadron of hussars, and engaging in many a ride which was not appropriate to an heir to a throne. To him soldiers are a privileged people; and it is not his fault if at times men are still improperly treated in the German army. When an officer was dismissed for such conduct, the Emperor wrote on the order of dismissal, "I should never have thought that I had such a brutal officer in my army." While yet a prince, and colonel of the Hussar Regiment of the Guard at Potsdam, he forbade his officers to indulge in play. As some of these gentlemen disregarded the prohibition, the Prince tried to get his grandfather to punish them severely; and, finding that the latter would not accede to his request, he proffered his resignation as colonel. This showed that the Prince was concerned with the moral welfare of the army; and as Emperor he has concerned himself with it still more, energetically suppressing excessive luxury and gambling among the officers.

At the same time he endeavored to increase materially the preparedness of the German army for war, and succeeded most thoroughly in doing so. For, under the long rule of William I, the army had not, in times of peace, degenerated; but, out of consideration for its aged chief, it had abstained from many innovations which had gradually become matters of necessity. Moreover, the aged monarch was very loath to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part with his generals, though they might be too old for serious work, and unfit to lead the troops into action.

Here then there was much to do; and it was done. Not only was the army increased in proportion to the increase in the population, but it was remodelled in many respects, especially as regards the age of the officers.

The Emperor expects a great deal of his army and its leaders, and often they seem to have reached the limits of human capacity; but he himself sets them the example, urging them on, and himself never tiring. What he gets through during the manœuvres excites the admiration of everybody. You should see him on his charger, galloping over the scene of operations at a pace which his suite can hardly maintain, following the movements of the troops with a keen eye, and often, by a brief word of command, altering their direction. He concerns himself at such times about the smallest detail; keeps his eye on every company which is within sight; and often goes himself to see whether his orders have been carried out to the minutest particulars. Frequently he changes the position of the outposts at the last moment, and at times visits them quite unexpectedly by night, to see that they are in order. While the manœuvres are going on he never knows what physical weariness is; often leaving his quarters at three or four o'clock in the morning, and not returning to them till six or seven in the evening. The intervening time is passed mainly on horseback. A good and sure rider, he turns up with his staff, as a rule, quite unexpectedly, in different places; takes over the command; and is always concerned in the first place for the men, their personal comfort being plainly his especial care.

His criticisms are calm and to the point. However generous he may be, he can find fault very sharply. Many an officer of high rank has doubtless felt a qualm as he has heard the signal sounding over the field to summon him to the Emperor's criticism of his operations. In case of a glaring mistake the Emperor is remorseless; and on one occasion he even sent a prince—nearly akin to him—and his regiment straight back to their garrison. On these occasions the independence of judgment and rapidity of decision of the Emperor are conspicuous. "As far as my experience goes, to my mind, that ought to have been done in such and such a way," he says; and then follows, in brief terms, a clear exposition of the right way to do it. Though one or the other of the higher officers in question may not formerly have quite agreed with the tactical instruction so given, opinions have changed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greatly in the last few years, and one now hears distinguished leaders combining to recognize the Emperor's tactical capacity and military powers of observation.

Of course this fondness for things military, which showed itself plainly even when he was a prince, gave rise to the most improbable reports when he came to the throne. He was spoken of as a "Soldier Emperor"; and there was no lack of warlike prophecies. But he has shown himself the most pacific of monarchs, and is always proclaiming his love of peace. "I should consider the man as a maniac or a criminal who urged the two peoples on to make war against each other," he declared to Jules Simon, when he attended the Workmen's Congress at Berlin. He knows how to appreciate the power which his army puts into his hands; but he knows, too, what it costs at times, if such power is misused. Though resolved to maintain his own and the Empire's honor to the last drop of his blood, and to avenge any insult in exemplary fashion, he will avoid anything that might lead to a conflict,—true to the words that he uttered at Bremen in April, 1890: "The highest duty of the ruler is to concern himself with the maintenance of peace."

People have often asked themselves which of his ancestors the Emperor most reminds them of; and various comparisons have been instituted, now in his favor, and again to his discredit. But none of the princes who have preceded him on the throne can be fitly compared to him; for he is the child of a new age, and in thorough sympathy with the aspirations of a united Germany, which none of his predecessors, except his father, has been. His is a personality apart, which will not fit into any existing historical frame. He has, however, certain points of resemblance with almost all the Hohenzollern princes who have made themselves remarkable in history. He shares with the Great Elector his love for personal administration, and the conscientiousness that leads him to see to everything himself; with Frederick I his fondness for the externals of sovereignty; with Frederick William I his love for soldiering and the chase; with Frederick the Great his musical and poetical occupations; with Frederick William III his absence of affectation and simplicity in domestic life; with Frederick William IV his fondness for oratorical effort and love of art; and, lastly, with William I his straightforwardness and devotion to such friends as he has once found true.

This many-sidedness, which has been no less prominent of later years, would be alarming, and might be justly characterized as an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

overstraining of all the powers, were it not the fact that the Emperor always finds relaxation and recovers his elasticity in his domestic circle. Here he is near to us as a man; here he appears in a different character from either of those we have been describing. Grave, conscientious, and constantly mindful of his high position and great responsibility as a ruler, in his home he is kind and affable; full of all the feelings of a father and spouse; often giving free vent to his good humor. He has a great deal of sprightliness and joviality in his temperament, and, as a "born Berliner,"—for, as is well known, not above a third of the inhabitants of "Athens on the Spree" are such, the rest being immigrants,—he uses on occasion the true Berlin patter for fun.

With all his gift of rapid receptivity, and his capacity for going deeply into a subject and quickly getting a general idea of it, the Emperor is not easily induced to give up an opinion he has once formed. Persuasion is of no use in such a case: he must be convinced by solid argument. He is not open to attempts to influence him; and the removal from Berlin of several very high personages, who might fairly have counted on his friendship, is ascribed simply to the fact that the Emperor wished to avoid the slightest suspicion of being influenced by them. In spite of the separation, however, he remained on terms of personal good-will toward them.

It is owing to his frank and resolute character that he always throws himself heart and soul into a cause; and where he has not already done so, his interest in it is very readily excited. There is no "routine-bred indifference" about him, such as grows into a habit with so many other princes. This comes out plainly in his public utterances. Whether he is opening the Diet in state, judging pictures at an art exhibition, proposing a toast on a festive occasion, engaging in a long conversation with a princely guest, or presenting to his consort in a few gracious words someone that he has invited to table,—whatever he says always produces the impression of real personal interest.

He is on the very best of terms with his wife. Once, at Schleswig, the home of the Empress, he spoke of her in loud, hearty tones as the pearl, more costly than any other gift, which that province had offered him. On another occasion he playfully declared to one of the friends of his youth that in his wife's dictionary three words beginning with a K were her favorites, "Kirche," "Kinder," "Küche" ("church," "children," "cooking"); adding, that he thought much more of a woman who, like his wife, could prepare a tasty dish than of ladies who interfered in politics and affected to be clever, but would never know

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anything about keeping house decently. These and many other speeches which have become known are the best proofs how highly the Emperor prizes German domestic life and its affections; and one hears often enough from people about the court that he is never more contented and happy than when with his family.

The imperial household is in the main simply conducted, and presents a sharp contrast to the pomp and display of the court on state occasions. The tone is cosy and homelike; and in the family circle the strict prescriptions of etiquette are disregarded. All members of the family, even distant relatives, use the familiar "thou" in speaking to each other; and their intercourse is as easy and unconstrained as that of the most thoroughly *bourgeois* household.

If the Emperor, when his spouse is away, talks about her to others, he calls her "my wife," or "the Empress"; while she generally speaks of him as "the Emperor," though to his face she often calls him "Willy." The children are addressed by their imperial parents by all sorts of pet names; though at times they also use nicknames, which refer to one or other of their little pranks. When she is away from them, the Empress always speaks of them as "my children"; but the Emperor, though the youngest is a princess, always says "my boys"; and the words have a special heartiness about them.

The children cling to their parents with touching love and devotion; and the latter, in their turn, when away from home, constantly think of the little ones, and bring back all kinds of presents as surprises for them. Once, when the Emperor won a thaler at a shooting competition of one of the Guard regiments, he took it with a smile of pleasure, remarking, "I will buy something for my boys with it; it will make them so happy!"

Not an evening passes without the Empress going to the children's bedsides, and praying with them, and kissing them good-night. On one occasion the three elder princes, who slept together in a separate room, begged so hard that she would come in again when she returned from the theatre that she consented, thinking that they would be asleep long before then. When, several hours later, the Empress went cautiously into their room again, the heads of the three lads looked out gayly from among the pillows. "Why, children!" cried she in astonishment, "not asleep yet? How have you managed that?" "Oh, mamma," said they, hardly able to speak for chuckling, "we tied a thread round our legs, and when one of us fell asleep, the others pulled at it, and then he was wide awake again at once!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What a deep and touching expression of his devoted love for his gentle and beautiful mamma did one of the princes find when he was undergoing religious instruction! When one day they came to a passage about all men being sinners, Prince Eitel Friedrich looked down at first thoughtfully, and then cried resolutely, "No, no, that is not true, for our mamma is not a sinner!"

The day begins early for the imperial pair. The Emperor rises before seven o'clock, takes a cold bath, at once puts on uniform, and breakfasts with his consort. Even when he has to get up much earlier, either for a review or to go shooting, he always has her company. Directly after breakfast, or sometimes during the meal, the children come in to say good-morning, which does not take long, especially with the elder ones, as their studies begin soon. Then the Emperor goes to his study, arranges the distribution of the day with his adjutants, receives the report of the court marshal, and takes a ride about nine—generally accompanied by his wife—in the direction of the Zoölogical Gardens. This is followed by a long walk; for the imperial Castle at Berlin has no grounds whatever about it. When he gets back to the Castle, there is writing to be done, there are reports and receptions to attend to, which fully occupy the forenoon and are continued in the afternoon.

About two o'clock, when no pressing engagements arise to prevent it, the imperial pair lunch in the dining-hall; the young princes being frequently present at this meal, and occasionally a guest specially invited by the Emperor. The two *flügel-adjutanten* or equerries and the ladies-in-waiting are in attendance.

Like Frederick the Great, William II likes good company at table; so there are always several guests at the six o'clock dinner,—as at the supper that follows at nine,—who are welcomed by him with a hearty shake of the hand. The meal generally consists of but few courses; but, however small the company, the table is always laid with costly plate and the choicest flowers. Of the latter the Emperor is particularly fond. It is at these small gatherings, after which cigars and Munich beer are handed round, that he shows himself most unconstrained. Almost every department of public life is freely handled on these occasions; and the Emperor encourages his guests, who are often scholars and artists, to speak freely. It frequently happens at such times that opinions differ to an extent unbefitting such a place; but the Emperor always knows how to interpose in a conciliatory way, or to put an end to the war of words by a sharp speech.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These little evening parties often last till eleven or twelve o'clock. If the Emperor is in a particularly good humor, he conducts his guests, as soon as the meal is over, to an old vaulted chamber in the basement. Here the old brown wainscoting and the seats around the walls, over which are hung plaques of Dutch china and bronze, as well as the old marble fireplace,—dating from the time of the Electors,—in which great logs crackle in winter, have a most cosy effect, and invite to confidential chat. The Emperor, it may be remarked, partakes freely of the food on the table,—especially certain favorite dishes,—but is very sparing in the use of wine and beer; though he presses these on his guests, and is an attentive and kind host.

In spite of the excessive quantity of daily work which he has to do, the Emperor finds time in which to devote himself to his family. He often pays a visit to his wife in the brief interval between two reports or receptions, to talk over things with her; for, however absolute he may be in other ways, he likes to hear and take into consideration the opinion of his consort on all but political and military questions. They are happy hours and full of refreshment which the imperial pair pass together between dinner and supper; for then the children are with them, and loud sounds of jubilation often issue from their apartments.

The bearing of the Empress is always full of gentleness and simplicity; and she is a striking instance of the truth of the saying, that that woman is the best who is least talked about. Innumerable evidences of warm love for her neighbor and of self-sacrificing charity are never heard of by the public; but, though enjoyed in secret, they are none the less a means of happiness to her. On one evening in every week she calls her ladies-in-waiting about her, and under her guidance and with her help they do work for poor families; while the extensive support given by the court to those in need is the outcome of personal inquiries of the Empress. She wishes to spread happiness around her, because she is happy herself; and the saying of a high official who has been brought much into contact with the imperial pair, that theirs is one of the happiest families in Germany, has foundation in fact.

The Emperor has much and most responsible work to do, and the hours—more frequently minutes only—of which he has the free disposal, are numbered. I am fully justified in saying that he is only secure from interruption when he is on the high seas, and the messengers, who at other times follow him everywhere with closely-packed despatch-cases, are unable to find him out. He can get through his day's task completely only by dint of long practice, by the most careful col-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laboration of the various officials, and by such a careful distribution of his time as leaves not a minute out of account.

The day generally begins with the examination of the correspondence received; the letters usually amounting to several hundreds. Many of these are petitions and are at once laid aside to be further dealt with by the civil staff. Where he recognizes the writing or the arms on a letter, the Emperor himself opens it, and either passes it on with a brief remark in writing to his private secretaries, or, more rarely, reserves it to be answered by himself. The series of reports is generally opened by that of the court marshal, who makes his in the Emperor's study. It generally takes up a good deal of time; for it deals with the conduct of the Emperor's household, the granting of audiences, the taking over of Protectorates, the giving permission for charitable lotteries, and the arrangement of journeys and visits.

But other matters are submitted to him by the marshal; for the Emperor likes to decide personally everything that concerns him and his court. Consequently plans for intended alterations in the palaces, for laying out new gardens, sketches and models prepared by artists for presents and prizes to be given by the Emperor, are laid before him. In addition, his attention is drawn to jubilees, special festivities, and occasions when he will have to return thanks; while the more pressing petitions are placed before him. After his short forenoon drive, and after lunch, the reports and receptions are resumed, the various ministers and heads of departments attend, audiences are given, various great personages are received, and officers and others make their reports. In the intervals between these duties the Emperor looks through important papers,—and he thinks a good many things important.

A great deal of time, especially in the winter months, is absorbed owing to the necessity, attaching to the Emperor's position, of his being personally present on great occasions. At such times even urgent business is laid aside for days together; and, not infrequently, when the acclamations of the people have died away, the electric lamps on the Emperor's writing-table burn late into the night. Not only that; but by his bedside are placed paper and pencil for him to make notes with.

It is manifest that with so much business to transact, there can be but little time left for reading. The Emperor, however, manages to keep himself well posted in the most important military works that appear at home and abroad. He also has brought to him every day a portfolio full of cuttings from the principal political organs of Berlin and the great provincial towns.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As regards belles-lettres, he prefers historical novels; though he does not neglect the more important works published in foreign countries. He also keeps a careful watch on the progress of art, both at home and abroad. For the Emperor is highly gifted as regards artistic qualities, and loves to be brought into contact with the great lights of art, and to encourage them in every way. All scientific questions, inventions, and discoveries awake the liveliest interest in his mind; and what he likes best is to have such matters explained to him by the savants in person, so as to get as deep an insight as possible into them. As soon as the news began to spread of Professor Roentgen's discovery of the X-rays, he sent a telegraphic invitation to the Professor, and listened for hours to his demonstrations with the closest attention. When a well-known Berlin savant, Professor Werder, who had been personally attached to the Emperor, died, the latter ordered a monument to be put over his grave, with the inscription, "Amico Imperator."

That, when all his powers are thus taxed to the uttermost, the Emperor at times finds himself in urgent need of relaxation, is a matter of course; and even the cruises, for which he was so blamed in the early days of his rule, are frequently the result of political aims. "In my youth I was never allowed to take long journeys," he said once in public, "because it was my grandfather's wish that I should always be at his side; but I consider it necessary for a ruler to inform himself personally about everything, and to form his opinions at first hand, to be personally acquainted with his neighbors, to establish friendly relations with them, and to maintain such. These are the aims with which I undertake my travels." The Emperor is always turning the prow of his stately yacht, the "Hohenzollern," northward, as the splendid scenery of Norway and the simplicity of its inhabitants have a strong attraction for him; and he always returns home thoroughly re-invigorated.

The picture that William II presents is that of a prince quite by himself; but it is an engaging and attractive picture none the less. Of one thing we may be quite sure; viz., that, should a time of danger ever arise for the German Empire during his reign, that empire will have at its head a man in the best sense of the word,—a man who knows what he wants; resolute and German to the core; fit to cope with troublous times, and to steer the ship of state with a sure hand. And the German nation will obey him with full confidence and trust.

PAUL LINDENBERG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AUTOCRAT OF CONGRESS.

ARMED with a plenitude of power beside which the authority of the President of the United States seems mean and insignificant, the Speaker of the House of Representatives is to-day the autocrat of Congress. He is the absolute arbiter of the destinies of all legislation, the court of last resort from whose decision there is no appeal. In the hands of designing or unscrupulous men the control now vested in the office of Speaker could easily menace the Republic with gravest danger. Even as it is, these functions have reached that all-compelling degree which demands something more than mere casual attention.

Occasion did not always necessitate this criticism. There was a time, not so very long since, when, instead of being their czar-like ruler, the Speaker of the House was rightfully the servant of the men who elevated him to his high position. It is true that in those days the absence of tyrannical prerogative was accompanied by deadlocks in the House, when hours and even weeks were lost through the employment of filibustering tactics. Against this wanton waste of time there was a very general protest; especially as the power to delay and finally to prevent action was exercised not alone against measures involving vital principles of government, but also in opposition to petty partisan schemes which rose to no higher plane than the distribution of spoils. That the inability of the Speaker to prevent the operation of obstructive tactics was provocative of evil is not to be denied; and the clamor of an impatient people against the continuance of such a practice was not surprising. Still, on the other hand, filibustering had its uses. It obtained for the minority—which was sometimes very close to a majority—some equitable rights which the drastic exercise of majority power otherwise denied.

But the question of filibustering was peremptorily decided in the negative by the Speaker of the House under peculiar circumstances. The Fifty-first Congress, at the time of its organization, contained a very narrow majority of Republicans. It became necessary to increase this majority to an extent which would insure the easier and more certain despatch of business;—a tariff bill and a so-called force bill, for in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stance, being demanded;—and Democrats holding certificates of election were ousted and Republican contestants seated with questionable celerity. The Democratic minority, angered at a proceeding so greatly at variance with legislative honesty and fairness, rebelled. They resorted to every parliamentary means to save their colleagues from speedy slaughter. To meet this emergency the Speaker of the House became a law unto himself. He conducted the daily business under that elastic code known as general parliamentary law, until he could secure the necessary majority to adopt new rules framed for the exigencies of the occasion. He counted a quorum instead of relying upon the record of personal responses; he became the judge of other men's purposes and intentions by deciding in his own mind whether certain motions were dilatory in their nature and then declining to entertain them; he refused to recognize members of the opposing party while according every privilege to those who were of his own political ideas; he became, in fact as well as in name, a parliamentary czar.

In the excitement of those stormy times party lines were closely drawn; and the Speaker was sustained in his action by the Republican Members of the House. No other course was open. A few there were, it is true, who anticipated with prophetic foresight the logical conclusion of a practical dictatorship. These few were promptly dragooned into the ranks; and their weak voices were unheard or unnoticed in the chorus of praise which ascended from loyal party followers. In due time a code of rules intended to curb and muzzle the turbulent and troublesome minority was framed. It departed from the precedents of the past, and lodged in the Speaker an extent of power almost beyond conception.

One of the most important innovations became known as the "special order." Under this scheme the programme of business in the House became vested in the Committee on Rules, which determined the measure to be taken up, the length of time to be allotted to debate, and the hour at which the vote should be taken. It is true that this "special order" was subject to the approval of the House; but party discipline could always be and has always been successfully relied upon to uphold the Committee. There are five Members in the Committee on Rules: three of the majority party, including the Speaker, and two of the minority. While this committee had in the past exercised more or less supervision of affairs, it became, under the new dispensation, the supreme head. Its members charted the route to be followed through the legislative sea. Their disposition to accord a hearing to a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measure had first to be secured before that proposition, however meritorious, could receive consideration in the House.

Ordinarily the lodgment of a directing power in the hands of five men—albeit 5 is a very small proportion of 356—might be excusable and wise; but, as a matter of fact, the practical operation of the present system reduces this quintette to a single individual—the Speaker of the House. In the first place, the two Members representing the minority are simply figure-heads. Their votes are as nothing in the balance against the majority; and frequently they are not even consulted. The original five, thus decreased to three, are still further reduced by an easy process to one. The two Members who are of the Speaker's political persuasion are selected by him with the full understanding that they will be the creatures of his will. Such an agreement may not be expressly stipulated in the bond; but its practical operation in that direction is certainly observable in the experience of the past few years. Neither of these two Members would ever break from his party and his chief to side with the hostile organization. If he did, he would be instantly deposed. Consequently, the pivot finally centres in the Speaker himself. Without his gracious sanction, no measure can come before the House. With him upon the side of any proposition, half the battle is gained; with him arrayed against it, the House is denied the opportunity of considering it, much less of voting upon it.

These are not exaggerated words. The Congress which has just closed afforded two striking examples of what could be done and what could not be done, according to the plèasure of the Speaker. The first instance was the bill to refund the debt of the Union and Central Pacific railroads. Here was a proposition which the Speaker favored. He had spent some time upon the Pacific coast during the Congressional recess, and was undoubtedly impressed by the earnestness with which certain parties interested in those roads sought Congressional action. Besides, he had had occasion to familiarize himself with the public feeling of that section of the country. Without analyzing the causes that swayed his mind, however, the fact remains that he assented to the assignment of several days for debate upon the refunding bill; even arranging that a Sunday should intervene between the close of the discussion and the taking of the vote. It so happened that the measure was overwhelmingly defeated; which all the more emphasizes by contrast the other case to which I desire to call attention.

The measure just alluded to was forced into the legislative arena with all the weight of the Speaker's influence thrown in its favor; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yet events demonstrated that it was unacceptable to a large majority of the Members of the House, irrespective of party. On the other hand, consideration for the Nicaragua Canal Bill was implored of the Speaker in a formal written appeal, to which about three hundred Members signed their names. The importance of this legislation needs no emphasis by me. Eight-tenths of the members of Congress were ready and anxious to debate and then act upon some proposition which should insure the building of a waterway to link the Atlantic with the Pacific, connecting the undeveloped resources of the Far West with the manufacturing cities of the Eastern coast, and shortening the route to Hawaii, Japan, China, and Australia by thousands of miles. In the Committee on Commerce were the signatures of 80,000 persons attached to petitions praying Congressional action; while only eighty-seven individuals were registered in opposition. Numberless boards of trade and chambers of commerce also filed their endorsement of the project. In the face of such overwhelming preponderance of sentiment, one would think that Congress would hardly have dared to hesitate. Congress as a body would not; but Congress as dominated by a single individual ignored the popular demand because, forsooth, that individual was adamantine in his antagonism to the proposed legislation. He was undoubtedly actuated by patriotic motives, believing that no private enterprise of such gigantic proportions should be endorsed by the Government. Still, it would seem as if this were a decision which rested with the representatives of the people. And let it be suggested, merely for the sake of illustrating the moral, that the same influences which operated favorably for the transcontinental lines might have been exercised in hostility to their formidable rival. Happily, such criticism does not and, in fact, could not obtain against the present occupant of the Speaker's chair. But the very fact that serious contingencies may arise under the present system emphasizes its evils and only too plainly indicates the danger which is threatened by the continued exercise of this one-man power.

It will naturally be asked why a Member does not appeal directly to the House in behalf of an important national measure; especially when, as in the case of the Nicaragua Canal Bill, he would be assured beforehand of the support of a majority of his colleagues. The answer exemplifies again the dominance of the Speaker. Not a Member of the House can secure the promise of recognition by the Speaker until he has acquainted the latter with the proposition which he intends to bring to the notice of the House. Without recognition he rises in vain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Consequently, every Member becomes subordinated to the caprice of the occupant of the Speaker's chair. No matter how important in point of aggregated wealth, commercial enterprise, or population may be the district which the Member represents; chosen though he be as a tribune of the people on an equality with the man who happens to be temporarily elevated to the custody of the gavel, he dwindles to a nonentity, save only as the Speaker suffers him occasionally to shake off the parliamentary chains which bind him. I have known more instances than one in which a Congressman has been relegated to private life because he failed in the matter of legislation vitally concerning his constituents. He would not have felt the force of this fatal discontent had the question at issue been considered and then defeated: his critics upbraided him and held him responsible because it had never even been brought to the attention of the House. Yet the fault did not lie with him. He was not delinquent: he was the victim of a system which made him dependent upon the Speaker's pleasure. It is no wonder that a man who is thus all-controlling is dined and wined and fêted and initiated into the enjoyments of the highest and most exclusive social life in Washington. Any man susceptible to these influences might be—I do not say he is or would be—disposed to give friendly regard to those Members who were in a position to offer him such advantages. At any rate, the opportunity for discrimination thus temptingly afforded should be removed.

But, although I have shown how the Speaker dominates the one committee which schedules legislation, and how he arbitrarily exercises the right of recognition, I have yet to mention what is, after all, the basis of the Speaker's autocratic power in shaping the destiny of proposed laws. The appointment of the committees of the House—those minor machines which sift out the wheat from the chaff in thousands of bills—is absolutely and solely in the hands of the Speaker. As soon as he is chosen for his high office he begins the work of framing these committees. He can, if he be so disposed, reward the friends who have given him their cordial support in the contest for the Speakership and revenge himself upon those who had the bad judgment or the temerity to oppose him. It may seem harsh to suggest that public position has been prostituted to the gratification of personal ends; but that even Speakers are in their passions like unto the commonest of human clay has been unfortunately proved more than once.

In the assignment of Members to commanding places the Speaker attracts to himself a personal support which intrenches him all the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more strongly in his position. He does not rely upon this, however, for influencing legislation, but, like a good architect, sees that the foundation of his structure is well laid. In the appointment of the committees this one man shapes the policy of the Congress over which he is to preside. Is he against the free coinage of silver? He can and does select men whom he can depend upon to report adversely upon a bill designed to secure that end; or, if the House is discovered to be friendly, the measure can be pigeon-holed. Is he inimical to a Federal uniform bankruptcy law? The Committee on Judiciary, when appointed, can be relied upon in its kindred antagonism. Is he for any legislation favorable to railroads? The committee, forthwith, is composed of a majority of men committed to his view. Are public buildings to be constructed? Are river and harbor improvements to be generously or niggardly dealt with? Is a general scheme for a revision of the finances of the country to be framed or ignored? In these and in a hundred other cases the desires of the Speaker are reflected in the personnel of the committees he appoints. Under these circumstances, the question is not what will the House do, but what are the purposes of the Speaker. If disposed to a jingo policy, he can place upon his Committee on Foreign Affairs enough men of ardent temperament, whose bump of belligerency is larger than that of judgment, to insure the report of soul-stirring but injudicious resolutions. If, on the other hand, he be controlled by conservative influences, it is impossible for the House to find any opportunity to express its sentiments upon a question swaying the public mind. Witness the fact, for instance, that not one of the Cuban resolutions introduced in the last House was ever reported back from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Certainly it needs no further argument or citation of fact to prove that the Speaker is, indeed, the autocrat of Congress. He frames the committees to suit his ideas; he decides what measures shall be heard; he recognizes or ignores any Member. Is the lodgment in him of such tremendous power a wise, prudent, or desirable thing? The question demands thoughtful consideration. Some there are—mostly recipients of favors from the Speaker's hands and secure always of his friendly coöperation—who will assert that, because his sovereignty has thus far been exercised more frequently for the country's good than to its injury, there is no occasion for its curtailment. With this more or less selfish view I cannot agree. While it may operate occasionally for good, such power presents untold opportunities for evil. I doubt the wisdom of its continuance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Members of Congress are already becoming restive under the bonds which they have unwittingly forged for themselves. They find that the Representative of the flourishing manufacturing district, of the farming community, of the commercial centre, is reduced to a mere cipher in the transaction of public business, and his legislative functions are usurped. His usefulness to his people at home is not only impaired, but is actually rendered *nil*, unless he manages to ingratiate himself with the Speaker. Chairmen of committees, when questioned regarding prospective legislation, are compelled shamefacedly to confess that it is the Speaker who is to be consulted. What is the result? If the individual member is outside the charmed circle of favored friends, his constituents clamor in vain while he chafes, silent and powerless, in his seat: if the bill which the chairman of committee is supposed to have in charge finds not favor in the Speaker's eye, it remains coffined upon a calendar already burdened with legislative corpses.

Now, then, as to the remedy. It is conceded, of course, that in a body of 356 Members some rules more or less arbitrary are necessary to insure the orderly conduct of business. Equally apparent is it, also, that the House cannot begin to act upon the multitude of measures which are introduced. Neither are the rules which obtain in the Senate applicable to the House. In the former body, any Senator arising and addressing the chair must be recognized; and no preliminary private announcement of his purpose is demanded. He can move to proceed to the consideration of any bill or resolution on the calendar, important or unimportant, and the question, not being debatable, must at once be determined by a vote; its disposition being dependent solely on the will of a majority of the Senate. It is true that a "steering committee," composed of nine Senators of the majority party, is empowered to arrange the order of business in regard to paramount measures, and that their schedule almost universally receives the assent of their colleagues; but the fact still remains that the programme is always subject to overthrow if it is not in accord with the views of a majority. In the House, I admit, such latitude as this would be impossible; but there is a happy medium between unrestricted freedom and autocratic control.

The lines along which these reforms could be instituted suggest themselves without difficulty. First of all, the absolute power of naming the committees should be divorced from the Speaker, and intrusted to a committee named at the caucuses of the two leading parties in the House. If it be successfully contended that this arrange-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, although working admirably in the Senate, would not operate satisfactorily in an unwieldy body like the House, then it would at least be wise to place the Speaker in a position where he must regard the respectful demands of his colleagues. When, for example, he is presented, as he was recently, with the appeal of more than a majority of Members to grant consideration to the Nicaragua Canal Bill and to the public-building bills upon the calendar, he should be required to yield to that combined request. Great as he is, he is not greater than all the men who placed him in his position. If needs be, the rule might be so framed as to compel his obedience only to a majority of the Members of his own party; thus relieving him from the possibility of being held subject to the wiles or whims of his political opponents. Under such a rule the measures desired by the House could be brought up for consideration; the length of the debate being arbitrarily fixed, as now, by the Committee on Rules. At the conclusion of the discussion the vote could be taken. If the bill should be beaten, the Speaker would be vindicated in his opposition. If it should pass, the responsibility would be with the House and with each individual Member thereof, who is answerable to his constituents. At any rate, the Members would have been allowed the privilege of recording their position, —a favor or a right which they do not now enjoy.

To some such solution of the problem, no valid objection can be raised. It would not block the wheels of Congress with matters of small concern, because the consent of a majority could not be obtained save for the consideration of supreme questions. It would, of course, decrease the prerogatives and influence of the Speaker. No longer would his room at the Capitol be crowded with suppliant Members, or his private residence be haunted by men whose projects are to be promoted or destroyed by his decision. But this is "a consummation devoutly to be wished." Even the Supreme Court of the United States—the highest judicial tribunal in the land—attempts no settlement of a case except by a majority of the court. To make the Chief Justice the final arbiter of every legal dispute would be as little sensible as to continue the investiture in the Speaker of the parliamentary power which he now enjoys. Something must be done, unless the House of Representatives is to dwindle to an aggregation of mere puppets—the useless, idle servants of a great people. Something must be done; otherwise the Speaker of the House will become not only the autocrat of Congress, but the autocrat of the whole nation.

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FALLACIES CONCERNING PRAYER.

THE fact revealed by the spectroscope, that the physical elements of the earth exist also in the stars, supports the faith that a moral nature like our own inhabits the universe. That the moral nature which is above the world is a supplicable nature, equally with the moral nature embodied in man, is a thoroughly reasonable assumption. Prayer, therefore, is grounded in reason, and needs only a rational development in thought and in expression.

Prof. Joseph Henry has observed that the whole progress of the physical sciences has been a series of interrogations of the Author of nature, in which every intelligent question has received an intelligible answer. This is the point of view in which one may fully accept the saying, "Laborare est orare." Science and Religion offer practically the same prayer—"Show me Thy way, O God." The specific difference is in the characteristic interest of each. Science, with its prayer of the intellect, is interested in the progress of knowledge. Religion, with its prayer of the heart, is interested in the progress of moral sympathy with righteousness.

But when one begins to argue, from the universal instinct of mankind, that prayer is a proper function of the life which, as the Stoics held, should be according to nature, one is often withstood by a reference to savages. "See what sort of deities men naturally pray to, and what sort of prayers men naturally offer!" That men thought to be scientific consider this a scientific mode of reasoning is a curious phenomenon. The truly natural is the raw rather than the ripe, in men, if not in grapes. It is as preposterous to go for light on the subject of prayer to such a fact as ancient devil-worship, as to turn to the embryo for a gauge of the genius of Shakespeare.

But whether in the savage who regards his deity as the physical progenitor of his tribe, or in the philosopher who thinks of God as the self-existent Universal Life which is the origin of all being and the source of all change, prayer assumes community of nature between man and God as constituting a basis of Divine sympathy with the world in its stress and strain. And so Cardinal Manning's theory of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prayer, that it is a means of realizing man's relation to God, is the most natural one. In this relation, the higher being must be not only the support and refuge of the lower, but also the norm and law. And so, just as natural appetite is necessary to prompt our attention to natural wants, an instinctive craving for God's help is requisite to promote remembrance of our duty to Him. It is this craving which gives the first impulse to prayer,—chiefly to the petitionary form of it, against which the current objections to prayer are mainly urged. While limiting attention to this, it must be noted that this is not the only, or only effective, form of prayer, any more than asking favors is the only form of communion among friends. Indeed, it is not unlikely that in the higher ranges of spiritual development the petitionary element in prayer will be found to grow less and less.

For many ages men have been trying by blundering experiment to realize their relation to God as the Author and Ruler of physical nature, but with partial success. Small wonder if less success has followed similar effort in the moral realm. None, indeed, confess failures in prayer more than those who are most given to it. Such failures prayerful men commonly impute only to their own ignorance and blundering. It is quite probable that the majority of all who pray have not learned to pray rationally any more than to live rationally; but that there is a rational prayer is as credible as that there is a rational life.

The problem of prayer, continually baffling, continually inviting, is not the only problem of the kind before the world. Science has problems of its own equally tantalizing. But this is a problem of the moral nature, which, as embodied in the world, essays to commune helpfully with the kindred moral nature that is above the world. On such a problem, as Prof. Bowne remarks in his "Principles of Ethics," a generation that is still in an embryonic stage of morality will be more reasonable in suspecting its scepticism as raw than in relying on its insight as ripe.

Already, however, the problem has been cleared of some fallacies by the leaders of religious thought. Such fallacies are: (1) the conception that prayer to God is comparable with prayer to the ruler of a state, who takes a petition into consideration, and grants or denies it as he judges best; (2) the notion that prayer aims to bring in an interfering power to alter miraculously the physical order of things; (3) the idea, akin to this, that prayer for moral betterment, as for the forgiveness of sins, can break the connection of cause and effect, so as to avert

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the natural consequences of any breach of physical or moral law. Some, with whom we go a mile in this direction, would have us go twain, and draw from the rejection of these fallacies equally fallacious conclusions. It is with these conclusions that I am now concerned.

As to the first, we assume the reality of a Divine purpose as sufficiently indicated in the evolution of nature and of man, and that this purpose cannot be contingent or indeterminate. It follows, of course, that a prayer which crosses that purpose is, so far as its object is concerned, a futile effort; but it does not follow that the prayer which falls in with that purpose is superfluous. Such a notion is a relic of the old thought of God as external to the world, and of the will of God as static rather than dynamic, aboriginally complete rather than eternally unfolding. It is out of date now, when the theist conceives of all the forces of the universe, in nature or in man, as Divine, and thinks of the Divine will as the movement of "an increasing purpose" through all the complex interplay of these forces, whether free or unfree.

The Divine purpose, whatever view we take of it, is realized through various agencies. The prayer which is in line with it serves to focus our will in that line, and to engage us more actively in pursuing it. For instance, the thrice-repeated prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane, "Thy will be done,"—so commonly misunderstood as expressing resignation to the inevitable,—was simple self-devotement to the thing that was to be done. It nerved Him to surrender His life at a crisis when He might easily have escaped. The beneficent consequences which that self-devotement has produced in the religious development of mankind are evidence, not only of a Divine purpose realizing itself through His free act, but also of the efficacy of prayer that is in line with a Divine purpose.

To pray daily that we may act with conscientious uprightness and kindness in daily affairs will be conceded to be conducive thereto. Many allege, however, that it is only a reflex effect upon ourselves which ensues. But this is not a full account of it. A reflected force does something. Of course, the primary effect of the prayer for uprightness is a reflex effect upon the man who prays; but it does not end there: something more ensues. The reflex effect in him passes directly outward into an objective effect produced by the uprightness which the prayer has promoted. This effect is extended to other men, and to what they do. It influences the course of human affairs in ever-widening circles. Consequently the reflex effect of prayer upon the prayerful becomes a determining power in the world for the promotion

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Divine ends. Thus, far from being superfluous is the prayer which accords with the Divine purpose.

As to the second point, there is indeed no interference through prayer with the natural order of things; but it is fallacious to conclude from this, that whatever there is in our prayers of petition for physical or spiritual benefit must be eliminated. Taking up first the physical, let us see if any interference with the ordinary laws of causation is necessarily involved in prayer for the healing of the sick.

Extravagant assertions of the power of prayer for healing have brought it into some discredit. But it is as wide of the mark to say that prayer has no power of that sort, as to say that it has all power. Unqualified, indeed, are St. James's words: "The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." But of course he did not forget that all must die. That prayer will have a curative effect to a certain extent, is the only meaning fairly imputable to him. Every physician will say the same, because he knows that auto-suggestion and expectant attention have a certain curative effect. When a bread pill produces the soporific effect of a morphine pill upon the patient who takes it as morphine, what we recognize is a psychological cause of sleep substituted for a physiological cause. The bread pill is necessary to bring the psychological cause into action.

Here we see what it is that prayer for the healing of the sick may legitimately undertake to effect; viz., no breach at all in the order of natural causation, but simply the substitution of a psychological for a physiological cause of cure. When the case is one to which a psychological cause is adequate, the cure will follow. Of course the condition of its effectiveness is, that the patient must fully believe in the healing power of prayer. At least, the prayer tends to call into activity the psychical powers of auto-suggestion and expectant attention. These are, indeed, equally effective, whether generated through prayer or otherwise; but I am now considering the power. If an undevout mind regards prayer in this case as mere incantation, a reverent mind is nearer the truth in holding that "there is no power but of God": whether in the psychical body or the political, "the powers that be are ordained of God."

Now it matters nothing for a valid judgment here that there is a large class of persons who are altogether superior in their own view to any such therapeutic agent. But denying a therapeutic agent to be a panacea does not expunge it from the list of remedies. Psychological therapeutics, however imperfectly understood, hold as secure—though

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not yet so large—a place as the physiological, which not long ago were in an equally crude state. It is with this as yet undeveloped province of the healing art that prayer stands in natural affinity. If it prove inadequate, so do all remedies sometimes. Certain physiological remedies are good for those only with whose constitutions they agree; and this much at least can be said of prayer. It might avail with a believer where it would fail with an unbeliever. Faith is as far from being impotent as from being omnipotent. "Possunt quia posse videntur." There is no field of effort in which this does not hold good.

The point just made, that a physical effect results in certain cases from a psychical cause brought into action by prayer, suggests some criticism of the assertion that it is irrational to pray for rain. This is usually put forward with such airy and even supercilious confidence that one who holds no brief for either side, but is simply concerned for close reasoning, may be justified in a search for weak points. To maintain a universal negative, one must either have universal knowledge, or be able to show an absolute impossibility. Let us see then what is actually known about this.

We know that our wills are among the causes which affect the order of nature within certain limits. By clearing forests we change a climate. By scientific manipulation of physical elements we produce new varieties of plants and animals. It is scientifically held possible to produce rain at times and places where atmospheric conditions are favorable to certain modes of operation. How much now must one know to warrant him in saying that he knows, rather than supposes, it irrational to pray for rain, in a climate that is not rainless? He must know: either (*a*) that there are no invisible intelligences superior to us; or (*b*) that, if there be, they are not sympathetically related to us; or (*c*) that, if they be so related to us, they have no such power as ours to effect changes in physical order according to physical law; or (*d*) that, if they have, they are not susceptible, like us, to any telepathic influence, such as the wills of a multitude of kindred beings united in fervent prayer might conjecturally exert; or (*e*), if they be susceptible, that they are positively inhibited, by some limitation of an unknowable kind, from responsive action; or (*f*), if this be not the case, that failure to bring them helpfully into action is not due to an imperfect development of psychical power in us, but to a natural impossibility.

Until we have adequate knowledge in all these particulars, it is certainly premature to dogmatize, either pro or con. Suspense of judgment is certainly a rational attitude for anyone who bethinks him-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self that there may be more things in heaven and earth than his philosophy has dreamed of. The rationality of prayer for rain is wholly a question of probability. If indemonstrable, it is also irrefutable. In estimating the worth of the probability, it must be said that none of the open points above stated is either arbitrarily taken or involves incredibility. At this point, it may be worth noting that the poets for the most part—certainly all the great poets—have firmly held to the objective efficacy of prayer as a power within the natural order of things.

> "At any rate,
> That there are beings above us, I believe;
> And when we lift up holy hands of prayer,
> I will not say they will not give us aid."

Some readers will probably arch their eyebrows here, and ask if we are not steering toward the Roman Catholic doctrine of the invocation of saints. By no means. That doctrine localizes God; setting him afar, where He has to be approached by intermediaries. We follow rather the thought of Virgil, "Jovis omnia plena." We simply refuse to localize God, the Universal Life, energizing through all the powers of the unseen environment, with which we come into conscious correspondence through prayer.

Third,—The widespread illusion, that prayer for moral betterment may operate as a cut-off of the evil consequences of an evil life, is a dangerous fallacy; though many religious teachers have countenanced it. But no less fallacious is the illusion, fostered by some who seem to be scientific, that the prayer, "Create in me a clean heart, O God," involves an appeal for miraculous interference. We are told that praying for a changed character and for a change of weather equally attempt the disturbance of natural causation, since character and weather are alike produced by natural causes. Under the term "natural" we are, of course, to include all moral as well as physical causes, however dissimilar these two orders of nature. Is it then supposed by the objector that the petitioner for a clean heart is making no endeavor for it, and fancies that he shall obtain it without endeavor? The Scriptures themselves say interchangeably, "Create in me a clean heart," and, "Make you a new heart." Why, then, this phrasing of the duty to make the heart clean into a petition to God to make it clean?

The reason is not far to seek. First, this petition is an expressive confession that man apart from God is nothing; that it is only from the Divine inworking and indwelling that the normal issues of life come.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Next, this confession is also a pledge of our purposed concurrence with Him to whom we appeal, and a girding of the will to work with Him toward the cleanness of heart we pray for. What more can be demanded here of natural causation adequate to the desired effect on character? Taken merely as words, "Create in me a clean heart" might be construed as a plea for a miraculous work. So might "The sun rises" be construed into assent to the Ptolemaic astronomy. But, as a matter of fact, they are never so used except by the foolish or perverse, or those who from such specimens spin flimsy objections.

The homœopathic rule, *similia similibus*, is inapplicable to the cure of error. On the one hand, many prayers for moral betterment are open to the objection that they contemplate a breach of causation. Many pray for the forgiveness of sins as for a governmental amnesty, which breaks the line of causation by arresting the operation of law against past offences. On the other hand, it is equally fallacious to conclude that there is no place in the natural order of causation for the forgiveness of sins, or for the prayer for it. The question turns on what is intended by the term "forgiveness." Strictly taken, it is expressive of personal feeling. In every instance it signifies the restoration of right feelings and relations between the offender and the offended. It is often extended beyond this to mean the cancelling of certain natural consequences of the offence. But this we often feel that we must not do, even when it is in our power. The best interests of the offender himself, and the interests of others, unite in the demand that he shall abide certain consequences of his act, although restored to favor and good-will. How then can it be contended that prayer for the Divine forgiveness must involve the breach of causation which forgiveness between man and man does not require? All that one can reasonably hold the Divine forgiveness as involving is the renewal of the harmony between the individual will and the Universal will that has been broken by human waywardness.

In using our anthropomorphic religious phraseology it behoves us to guard against its illusive tendency; but use it we must—some of it at least—or remain speechless with risk of becoming thoughtless: for it is all we have. When we ask a neighbor's forgiveness, we ask him to change his mind toward us. But we do not ask God to change; at least, not if we think wisely. Our request to our neighbor implies that we feel toward him as we ought. This is all that our prayer to God can rationally imply. It is complete in its expression of the return of a wayward will to loyalty and obedience. Doubtless, through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

various misconceptions of God, much more is often added which is either mere verbiage or worse, and thus also in need of forgiveness. The Divine forgiveness is not to be begged for, but to be accepted; as the sunlight upon the face is to be had by turning to it. But the desire of it and the acceptance of it demand clear realization in consciousness, and therefore require expression in prayer. The true norm of such expression is not "Have mercy upon us miserable offenders": it is in the words which Jesus puts into the mouth of the penitent prodigal,—"Father, I have sinned."

Here we have to take account of the deprecatory element in such a prayer. Some demand that deprecation shall be eliminated from prayer, as being a relic of that self-mutilation which accompanied primitive devil-worship. One may well object to certain expressions of self-abasement in prayer; as in Watts's lines,

> "Great God, how infinite art thou!
> What worthless worms are we!"

But, on the other hand, in any clear consciousness of an unattained ideal some self-abasement is both a common and an inevitable experience. Object, as we must, to deprecation in the literal sense of the word, as an attempt to avert evil by entreaty, there is at the heart of it a consciousness which must not be extirpated. Perception of the contrast between what we are and what we ought to be inevitably produces that self-abasement, or, if another phrase is required, that sincerely felt humility of the imperfect before the Perfect, which is the condition alike of patient effort for better things and of prayer as auxiliary thereto. The objection, therefore, that prayer for the forgiveness of sins involves a breach of the laws of causation, may be valid enough against some popular notions, and some church teaching, but is of no force against the conception of it here presented.

Some consideration is now demanded of the causative relation in which the prayer for forgiveness stands to the effects of an evil life. Our past deeds are indestructible. Their consequences flow on without break or cut-off. The transgressor's future can never be the same that it would have been, had his past been free from transgression. What, then, is the utmost that can take effect *directly* in and through his prayer for forgiveness? Simply the righting of his voluntary relation to God. This is, of course, a reflex effect; but, like any other effect, it becomes in turn a cause of further effects. These, however indirect, must be counted as effects of his prayer, or of the inward

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change in him which is both expressed and promoted by his prayer. Without the least breach of causation, a new cause has been added to the causes at work in the past; and this new factor must somehow affect the product. Thus the prayer will be found, after all, to have a certain potency for change in the natural connection of cause and effect. A typical instance is that of St. Paul, whose past vehemence as a persecutor became, on his conversion, a spur to zeal as an apostle. Scientifically expressed, it is a clear case of the persistence of energy with convertibility of force.

It is plain here that while the evil past counts for its full effect, it counts also in another direction. So the muck-heap, which counts for poison and death while it rots above ground, counts for fertility and life when put under ground. The debt of consequences due to the past must be paid to the last farthing. But the new-strung will, the aspiration, the hope, which now face that debt, have changed the conditions of dealing with it. Prayer brings these new factors into the problem. Their efficacy in creating, as it were, a sinking-fund for that debt must be credited to the account of prayer. Moreover, such is the interaction of mind and body, that physical as well as moral betterment is often discoverable in the result.

Strange that it has not entered the minds of those who write against the reasonableness of prayer for physical or moral betterment, that there may be more tenable ideas than the old and crude notions against which they direct their polemics. What would such men of science say, if theologians should fancy it worth while to combat the defunct theories of medicine, chemistry, and physics, which line the road of scientific progress, as the bones of beasts fringe a caravan route across a desert? Theology as well as science should be allowed the right to bury its dead.

A point where controversy has generated more heat than light can now be adequately treated. Prof. Tyndall's famous test, proposed for a scientific estimate of the effectiveness of prayer, assumed that this is to be proved or disproved according as particular prayers for specific objects are or are not "answered." This is a mistake analogous to that of suspending the question of the Divine control of events upon the occurrence of miracles in Palestine or elsewhere. It requires no special cases of "answer" to evince the effectiveness of prayer: it is attested by the ethical development of mankind.

The great pioneers of moral progress, the men who have wrought most influentially for the moral enlightenment and reformation of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world, have habitually communed in prayer with the Unseen Power. On this they have depended for the replenishment of their own inner springs of action and endurance. Witness Jesus, following days of active benevolence in the city with nights of prayer on the mountain. The reflex inward effects pass out into the objective effects wrought by these great lives in the world. The changes they brought to pass in the thoughts and actions of mankind must be held as in large measure resultant from their habitual prayer. Then there is the host of martyrs of all kinds, to whose constancy in evil times it was due that desperate struggles for truth and righteousness were crowned with victory. What but the confident committal of their cause to Him who judges righteously nerved them to brave the fire and the sword? Nor can account be omitted of the multitude of obscure lives, to whose conscientious fidelity in common duties the present order and stability of society are due; who seek in religion the sanctions of morality; who daily look up to God as Father and Judge; and who in doing so find the spur to honest successful effort. This is the true line of sight in which to look for convincing attestation of the objective as well as the subjective efficacy of prayer. Like the Divine control, to which it is in fact subsidiary, it is not an occasional, but a constant, factor in the unfolding of the order of the living world.

Thus far our concern has chiefly been to clear the subject of some fallacies and pseudo-scientific prejudices. It remains now to indicate some points of a mainly constructive line of thought.

Prayer, as Coleridge insisted, is a very different thing from saying prayers. It is an activity of the whole man. Real prayer engrosses and focuses feeling and desire, thought and will, for the direction of the whole self upon its object. Here, undeniably, a real force is apparent, as much as in any movement of our will upon the external world. It is the force of an ethico-spiritual nature, not isolated, but related to nature of the same kind, both seen and unseen. To deem it futile, "a chimera buzzing in a vacuum," is to escape one difficulty by rushing into a greater,—at least for anyone who remembers that action and reaction are inseparable.

The records of the Society for Psychical Research abound in fully verified instances of communications sped from friend to friend, in a moment across hundreds of miles, in some supreme crisis which called into momentary action some previously latent energy of the spirit. Such cases suggest the yet undiscovered possibilities and limits of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prayer, considered simply as a mode of psychical force moving upon an unseen psychical environment, through which, as through the physical, Divine forces are ever energizing in the interplay of action and reaction. That religious enthusiasm dwells closer to the springs of this mysterious force than our present science or philosophy, is thoroughly credible. The saying attributed to Jesus, that, if He chose, He could by prayer summon myriads of spirits to His aid, is not to be thought the idle fantasy of one unique in spiritual insight and energy. Much more reasonable is it to suppose that men in an embryonic stage of moral and spiritual development are as incapable of employing such a force intelligently as are savages of using mathematical instruments.

Viewing prayer as a real force in the complex of world-forces, Dr. F. H. Hedge has well observed that it will tend to overbear or to be overborne, according to its intensity. Many prayers, including all the merely formal, are, by defect of energy, foredoomed to failure; just as many infants die through defect of vitality. Like other forces, prayer will also be most effective in the line of least resistance. The prayer must be weak whose force is that of a mere individual interest, dissociated from, or indifferent if not antagonistic to, the general welfare of the world. That prayer is strong which blends with the great tide of aspiration and effort toward Divine ends. What John Stuart Mill observed of justice is true of prayer. An interest of personal apart from general welfare is an element of impurity in it, and therefore an element of weakness. The Lord's Prayer significantly conforms to this law of efficiency. How notably is its reference to the personal and transient subordinated to and uplifted by its interest in the universal and eternal! This is characteristic of that effectual prayer which the New Testament describes as being in the "name," that is, in the spirit, of Jesus. There is, of course, an organic relation of human needs to Divine ends which cannot always be consciously realized, even in prayer. On psychical principles it would be least realized in the automatic uprightness of the faithful life, which is, as Origen said, the practical utterance of the Lord's Prayer.

The question which some still think it worth while to ask, "Why does a loving God, who knows our needs, require us to petition for their supply?" both reveals the fundamental misconception and brings into contrast the fundamental truth in regard to the whole subject. Dr. Edward Caird has noted, as a strange survival of the pagan mode of thought among Christians, that some of them still conceive of prayer as an attempt to get God to do man's will, rather than as an aspiration

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to get God's will done by men. Jesus has expressly cautioned us not to think that either He prays or we pray for the purpose of informing God about our needs or inducing Him to supply them. What end, then, is served by petitionary prayer for the things God knows we need, and that He wills to bestow? Surely no thinker is unaware that verbal expression has much to do with both clearness of thought and the concentration of attention and will. It is reason enough for engaging in petitionary prayer, that the confession in words of our wants to God enables and pledges us in a clearer consciousness to work out more reverently and patiently the Divine conditions of their supply.

Thus it is that through prayer the individual will strives toward unity with the Universal will. To impute to the leaders of religious thought to-day the crude, primitive fancy of bending the Divine will into line with the human is unworthy of any who profess to keep abreast of the world's advancing intelligence. The true function of prayer is to lift the will of man into line with the will of God. This it does by its effect in clarifying moral insight, deepening reverent convictions of responsibility, and dedicating self more thoroughly to Divine ends, which can be accomplished in the world no sooner or more fully than men devote themselves to their fulfilment.

God, or atoms! This is the alternative which is ultimately forced upon us by the question whether to pray or not to pray. From intellectual perplexity there is no escape, whichever solution of the mystery of life we elect. To the moral certainty which the problem yields, one of the greatest names in contemporary science has just left us his posthumous testimony that there is "a vacuum in the soul of man which nothing can fill but faith in God."[1] Of this faith the vital breath is prayer.

JAMES MORRIS WHITON.

[1] GEORGE J. ROMANES, in "Thoughts on Religion," p. 162.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAS POE A PLAGIARIST?

VERY few people to-day, even in literary circles, know anything about Thomas Holley Chivers, M.D. And even these know very little. He was a poet of at least one book before Bryant made that brief anthology of sixty or more American poets in 1840;—mostly names that have vanished long since into the everlasting inane;—but he was not there represented. His first volume of verse appeared in 1837; though fugitive lyrics from his pen were doubtless afloat on the periodical seas long before that year. Poems over his signature were contributed as late as 1853 to "Graham's Magazine" and to the "Waverley Magazine" of Boston.

It is, however, simply repeating an indubitable fact, to say that a large part of the poetry of Chivers is mainly trash,—of no account whatever, and not above the reams of stanzas which from time immemorial have decorated as "original" the country newspaper's poet's corner. But now and then he struck a note quite above this dead and wide-pervading commonplace; and, whenever he did, the verses brought forth were apt to suggest the mechanism and flavor of Poe. He not only said at various times—especially in a series of letters which he wrote to Mr. Rufus W. Griswold, Poe's biographer, and which are now in the possession of his son[1]—that Poe had borrowed largely from him, but he put the transaction in much bolder terms. The charge of flagrant plagiarism of himself by Poe, in respect even of "The Raven" and "Annabel Lee," was not withheld, but was violently advanced by Chivers. Nor was he alone in making this charge. Some of his friends took it up and repeated it with a vehemence and an ability worthy of a most sacred cause. There is circumstance enough about this, to say nothing of its singularity, to elevate Chivers into something of a topic,—one worth considering at least for a moment.

What is known about this author is, that he published seven or eight volumes of poems between, and inclusive of, 1837 and 1858,—a

[1] Mr. W. M. GRISWOLD, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, to whom I am greatly indebted for many of these facts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

period of twenty-one years. Many of them antedate Poe's period of literary activity, and not a few have the Poe afflatus and melody so strongly inherent in them that even the non-critical reader could not mistake their related quality. In Chivers's "Lily Adair," which crowns his high-water mark of poetic achievement, the Poe manner stands out conspicuously. This refrain from it, for instance, varied in some details at the end of each stanza, illustrates what I mean:—

> "In her chariot of fire translated,
> Like Elijah, she passed through the air,
> To the city of God golden-gated—
> The home of my Lily Adair—
> Of my star-crowned Lily Adair—
> Of my God-loved Lily Adair—
> Of my beautiful, dutiful Lily Adair."

Chivers, in this poem, and in others which resemble Poe's work, made Biblical allusion a dominant trait to an extent that Poe did not, and really attained, though not always with perfect sanity, to much of Poe's witchery and charm.

It is not my intention in this article to repeat the history and evidence which I presented and published elsewhere a year and a half ago concerning Chivers's claims against Poe. It will be sufficient for the purpose now in hand if I report, as briefly as may be, what Chivers and his friends, and those who antagonized the Chivers assumption, had to say about it forty-four years ago.

In a quite able and stalwart way Chivers himself opened the contest, under the *nom de plume* of "Fiat Justitia," in the "Waverley Magazine" of July 30, 1853. In a long article, entitled "Origin of Poe's 'Raven,'" he claims that the laudators of Poe—particularly N. P. Willis, who said of "The Raven" that it "electrified the world of imaginative readers, and has become the type of a school of poetry of its own"—"betray not only a deplorable ignorance of the current literature of the day, but the most abject poverty of mind in the knowledge of the true nature of poetry." He then quotes from his own book, "The Lost Pleiad," the following lines from the poem "To Allegra in Heaven," which was published in 1842,—a few years before "The Raven" appeared. He asserts that these lines "show the intelligent reader the true and only source from which Poe obtained his style" in that poem:—

> "Holy angels now are bending to receive thy soul ascending
> Up to Heaven to joys unending, and to bliss which is divine;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While thy pale cold form is fading under Death's dark wings now shading
Thee with gloom which is pervading this poor broken heart of mine!
And as God doth lift the spirit up to Heaven there to inherit
Those rewards which it doth merit, such as none have reaped before;
Thy dear father will to-morrow lay thy body with deep sorrow,
In the grave which is so narrow, there to rest forevermore."

In this article Chivers also says that Poe is not entitled to priority in the use of the refrain "Nevermore." It was Chivers, he says (still writing under his *nom de plume*), who originated this in a poem entitled "Lament on the Death of my Mother," published in 1837 in the Middletown, Connecticut, "Sentinel and Witness." The following extract from it is the proof he offers:—

"Not in the mighty realms of human thought,
Nor in the kingdom of the earth around;
Nor where the pleasures of the world are sought,
Nor where the sorrows of the earth are found—
Nor on the borders of the great deep sea,
Wilt thou return again from heaven to me—
No, nevermore!"

The reader, I imagine, will be likely to think that Poe gave this refrain a more potent and appalling quality.

It is urged that Poe knew of Chivers's "The Lost Pleiad, and Other Poems," as he "spoke of it in the highest terms in the 'Broadway Journal' in 1845." The writer admits that "Poe was a great artist, a consummate genius; no man that ever lived having possessed a higher sense of the poetic art than he did." But he urges that this fact must not obliterate the other; viz., that he took the liberty, arrogated by genius, to borrow.

After saying that Chivers (he speaks of himself all along as another person) was the first poet to make the trochaic rhythm express an elegiac theme, and the first to use the euphonic alliteration adopted by Poe, he cites the following extract from a poem of his published before Poe's masterpiece in verse appeared:—

"As an egg, when broken, never can be mended, but must ever
Be the same crushed egg forever, so shall this dark heart of mine,
Which, though broken, is still breaking, and shall nevermore cease aching,
For the sleep which has no waking—for the sleep which now is thine!"

To step up to "The Raven" from so grotesquely low a level, one might easily consider—even were the charge of plagiarism proved—a complete absolution of blame.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And, if this is admitted to be the fountain whence Poe got his form, an irreverent critic might say he reproduced it with unsurpassable effect and dissociated from it the atmosphere of Humpty-Dumpty.

In the "Waverley Magazine" of August 13 of the same year, "Fiat Justitia" (Chivers) is taken in hand by "H. S. C." and "J. J. P.," on behalf of Poe. The difference in altitude and genius of the two writers is emphasized by them. Poe's personal character is palliated; but the question of priority in the use of the Poe alliterative rhythm is not argued. The only reply touching this is by the first of the two writers, who shows that "Nevermore," as a refrain, is nobody's trade-mark, since it has been used even earlier than Chivers's employment of it. As an instance buttressing this statement, he offers the following stanzas from a very old scrap-book in which the poem of which they are a part is credited to the Cheshire, England, "Herald":—

"Now the holy pansies bloom
Round about thy lonely tomb;
All thy little woes are o'er;
We shall meet thee here no more—
Nevermore!

But the robin loves to sing
Near thee in the early spring;
Thee his song will cheer no more
By our trellised cottage door
Nevermore!"

The same writer asks if his antagonist cannot, by his form of logic, prove that Poe stole his poem of "The Bells" from the nursery rhyme of "Ding Dong Bell." A week later than this, "Fiat Justitia" re-appears in the "Waverley Magazine," together with an ally signing himself "Felix Forresti" (possibly Chivers again[1]), who, seeing him attacked by two knights of the pen, "takes up the cudgels" for Chivers. In fact, to be more truthful, all these writers—speaking metaphorically—take up pitchforks and machetes. Their Billingsgate style savors of the Arizona "Howler," and seems impossible to Boston. In this week's onslaught, however, no point of note occurs, except that the latter writer exhumes from a poem by Chivers, upon Poe, which was

[1] That an author could so write of himself, under masked signatures, is surprising. But the articles were substantially made up from his letters to Mr. R. W. Griswold, Poe's biographer,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

published in the Georgia "Citizen" about 1850, the following lines:—

"Like the great prophet in the desert lone,
He stood here waiting for the golden morning;
From Death's dark vale I hear his distant moan
Coming to scourge the world he was adorning—
Scorning, in glory now, their impotence of scorning.
And now in apotheosis divine,
He stands enthroned upon the immortal mountains
Of God's eternity, for evermore to shine—
Star-crowned, all purified with oil-anointings—
Drinking with Ulalume from out th' eternal fountains."

And the writer adds: "Until both . . . champions [of Poe] can write just such lines as these, they had better 'shut up shop.'"

But neither side "shut up shop" just then. In the issue of September 10, "Fiat Justitia" and "J. J. P." reappear. The former occupies nearly three columns with extracts from Chivers's poems to show the Poe manner, and to prove that it was in these poems Poe found it. The following sample is from "The Lost Pleiad":—

"And though my grief is more than vain,
Yet shall I never cease to grieve;
Because no more, while I shall live,
Will I behold thy face again!
No more while I have life or breath,
No more till I shall turn to dust!
But I shall see thee after death,
And in the heavens above I trust."

The following extract is from Chivers's "Memoralia":—

"I shall never more see pleasure,
Pleasure nevermore, but pain—
Pleasure, losing that dear treasure
Whom I loved here without measure,
Whose sweet eyes were Heaven's own azure,
Speaking, mild, like sunny rain;
I shall nevermore see pleasure
For his coming back again!"

Of "The Lost Pleiad" volume, "Fiat Justitia" says that a Cincinnati reviewer declared, some years ago, that "there is nothing in the wide scope of literature, where passion, pathos, and pure art are combined, more touchingly tender than this whole unsurpassed and (in our opinion) unsurpassable poem."

Another sample of Chivers's pre-Poe likeness the writer finds in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poem titled "Ellen Æyre," which was printed in a Philadelphia paper in 1836. He gives this stanza from it:—

"Like the Lamb's wife, seen in vision,
Coming down from heaven above,
Making earth like Fields Elysian,
Golden city of God's love—
Pure as jasper—clear as crystal—
Decked with twelve gates richly rare—
Statued with twelve angels vestal—
Was the form of Ellen Æyre—
Gentle girl so debonair—
Whitest, brightest of all cities, saintly angel, Ellen Æyre."

Very many other Poe-resembling extracts are given; but these must suffice from the verse. To show that Poe borrowed from Chivers in a prose criticism, our writer copies the following passage from an article by Chivers in the Atlanta "Luminary":—

"There is poetry in the music of the birds—in the diamond radiance of the evening star—in the sun-illumined whiteness of the fleecy clouds—in the open frankness of the radiant fields—in the soft, retiring mystery of the vales—in the cloud-sustaining grandeur of the many-folded hills—in the revolutions of the spheres—in the roll of rivers, and the run of rills."

Now look on this, from Poe's "The Poetic Principle":—

"He recognizes the ambrosia, which nourishes his soul, in the bright orbs that shine in heaven . . . in the waving of the grain-fields—in the blue distance of mountains—in the grouping of clouds . . . in the twinkling of the half-hidden brooks—in the gleaming of silver rivers—in the repose of sequestered lakes—in the star-mirroring depths of lonely wells . . . in the song of birds—in the sighing of the night-wind . . . in the fresh breath of the woods, etc."

Triumphantly the writer says, "Now . . . you will no longer wonder where Poe obtained his very delightful knowledge of the art of poetry." Not only the Chivers prose extract, but also the verse passages quoted by him were written, he affirms, "long anterior" to the parallel passages in Poe.

In the "Waverley" of September 24 following, "J. J. P." quotes Poe as saying of "The Raven," "I pretend to no originality in either the rhythm or metre." He also quotes Poe as saying of the passage by Chivers containing the egg simile: "That the lines very narrowly missed *sublimity* we will grant; that they came within a step of it we admit; but, unhappily, the step is that *one* step which, time out of mind, has intervened between the *sublime* and the *ridiculous*."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The whole controversy was continued with warmth in the "Waverley Magazine" of October 1, 1853, by "Fiat Justitia," who began it. I am told, too, that it was reopened in a later volume. As the "Magazine" office files were long ago destroyed by fire, I cannot say how the renewed controversy fared; though it probably closed with nothing fresher than new epithets coined by the combatants. Nor is anything that is particularly new added by this article. It was mainly a threshing of the old straw, which, all the way through, was supplemented by a rhythm analysis that would take too much space to follow. From the Chivers poem "To Allegra in Heaven" he adduces this theretofore unquoted line,

> "Like some snow-white cloud just under Heaven some breeze has torn asunder—"

which he thinks suggested Poe's two lines:—

> "And the silken sad uncertain rustling of each purple curtain"—
> . . . . . .
> "Much I marvelled this ungainly fowl to hear discourse so plainly."

Chivers, it seems, wrote for a variety of periodicals, among which were "Graham's Magazine" and "Peterson's"; and in the year this controversy was raging he contributed poems to the "Waverley Magazine" itself. In "Fiat Justitia's" contention, it is said that Poe was obliged to reply in the "Broadway Journal," in defence of the plagiaristic charge, to some writer using somewhere the *nom de plume* of "Outis." There was, in connection with the Chivers assumption and advocacy, a surprisingly earnest and hot assault. Only one more of these militant articles (possibly by Chivers again) shall I notice here. He, signing himself "Philo Veritas" in the "Waverley Magazine" of October 8, 1853, communicates a "Railroad Song" taken from "Graham's," which was written by Chivers, and which he terms "a truly *original* poem." He does so in part for the purpose of "exposing one of the most pitiful plagiarisms" known—the "wishy-washy thing" entitled "Railroad Lyric," that had appeared in "Putnam's Monthly" of the previous May. Here are some lines from the one hundred and thirteen composing Chivers's poem:—

> "All aboard! Yes! Tingle, tingle,
> Goes the bell as we all mingle—
> No one sitting solely single—
> As the steam begins to fizzle—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With a kind of sighing sizzle—
Ending in a piercing whistle—
. . . .
And the cars begin to rattle,
And the springs go tittle-tattle—
Driving off the grazing cattle,
As if Death were Hell pursuing
To his uttermost undoing,
Down the iron road to ruin—
With a clitter, clatter, clatter,
Like the Devil beating batter
Up in Hell in iron platter,
As if something was the matter;
Then it changes to a clanking,
And a clinking and a clanking,
And a clanking and a clinking—
. . . .
As if Hell for our damnation,
Had come down with desolation
. . . .
While the engine overteeming
With excruciating screaming,
Spits his vengeance out in steaming.
. . . .
Still repeating clitter, clatter
Clitter, clatter, clitter, clatter
As if something was the matter—
While the woodlands all are ringing,
And the birds forget their singing,
And away to Heaven go winging.
. . . .
Then returns again to clatter
Clitter, clatter, clitter, clatter
Like the Devil beating batter
Up in Hell in iron platter—
Which subsides into a clankey,
And a clinkey and a clankey
And a clankey and a clinkey
And a clinkey, clankey, clankey—
Then to witchey, witchey, witchey,
Chewey-witchey, chewey-witchey—
Chewey-witchey, witchey, witchey,
Then returns again to fizzle,
With a kind of sighing sizzle—
Ending in a piercing whistle—
And the song that I now offer
For Apollo's golden coffer—
With the friendship that I proffer—
Is for riding on a Rail."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There was one poem of Chivers's, entitled "The Little Boy Blue," copied in the "Waverley Magazine," which is singularly saturated with the nomenclature and manner that Poe affected. Here are a few illustrative stanzas out of the thirty-seven to which it extended:—

"The little boy blue
  Was the boy that was born
In the forests of Dew
  On the Mountains of Morn.

. . . .

There the pomegranate bells—
  They were made to denote
How much music now dwells
  In the nightingale's throat.

. . . .

On the green banks of On,
  By the city of No,
There he taught the wild swan
  Her white bugle to blow.

. . . .

Where the cherubim rode
  On four lions of gold,
There this cherub abode
  Making new what was old.

. . . .

When the angels came down
  To the shepherds at night,
Near to Bethlehem Town
  Clad in garments of light,
There the little Boy Blue
  Blew aloud on his horn,
Songs as soft as the dew
  From the Mountains of Morn.

. . . .

But another bright place
  I would stop to declare,
For the Angel of the Face
  Of Jehovah was there.

. . . .

Now this happy soul dwells
  Where the waters are sweet,
Near the Seven-fold Wells
  Made by Jesus's feet."

Not only are the Poe phrases here, but here, too, is the tossing, tumultuous imagination of William Blake. I know of no writer who, so much as Chivers did, fell into Blake's phantasmagorial extravagance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The upshot of this cursory consideration of the voluminous controversy—beginning before Poe died, and virulently continued for some years after his death—shows that Poe knew Chivers's work and paid attention to him in more than one reference. The literary representatives of the minor poet appear, also, to bring forward some striking examples of verse which he wrote, which was outwardly like Poe's, and which considerably antedated "The Bells," "The Raven," and "Annabel Lee," on which Poe's poetic fame rests.

What conclusion must be drawn from these facts? Each reader will be certain to make his own. No critic will doubt that to Poe belonged the wonderful magic and mastery of this species of song. If to him who says a thing best the thing belongs, no one will hesitate to decide that Poe is entitled to the bays which crown him. It is a fact that, with all the contemporary airing of the subject, it is Poe's celebrity and not Chivers's that remains. The finer instinct and touch are what the world takes account of. Chivers, except at rare intervals, did not approach near enough to the true altitude. He put no boundary between what was grotesque and what was inspired. He was too short-breathed to stay poised on the heights, and was but accidentally poetic. But we may accord him a single leaf of laurel, if no more, for what he came so near achieving in the musical lyric of "Lily Adair." Truly enough Shakespeare says:—

> "The lunatic, the lover and the poet,
> Are of imagination all compact . . ."

Their mental and spiritual territories interblend. The same frenzy is the endowment of each—as charcoal is in essence the diamond. As you differentiate and develop it you make your titular distinction and place. But it is not a small thing to have been mingled in some slight association with genius, and to have some credit you with it. In an Oriental poem the clay pipe speaks of its contentment, since it cannot be a rose, of having, by a fortunate association, attained to some of the rose's fragrance.

JOEL BENTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIALISM IN FRANCE.

"Socialism long ago ceased to exist."—
(Gen. VON GOSSLER, Minister of War,
in the Reichstag, 12 Feb., 1897.)

HAD the Emperor William's minister really spoken truly, the history of socialism might be summed up in a short epitaph: "There were those senseless enough to believe that social justice might be enthroned among men. They proclaimed it to their contemporaries, who, on examination, saw that it was folly. Peace and pity to their memory! There is no law but that of the strongest."

Have we reached this point? Despite the imposing authority of a minister of the German Emperor, it does not appear to me in the least proven. "If I order you," said William II to his soldiers, "to fire on your father and your mother, you must obey me." This superior rule of government has one peculiar advantage—it reduces the organization of society to the simple expression of one arbitrary will disposing at discretion of the very life of the governed. That is the rudimentary conception of primitive societies. It is hardly a matter of pride for us, nearing the twentieth century, that one of the most powerful potentates of Europe should openly claim for himself the absolute control of his fellow-beings, which so many savage autocrats are content to exercise without venturing to formulate in terms of such offensive brutality. I am well aware that it is pure bravado, and that, should he seek to act on it, he would have trouble. This régime, indeed, implies that the human herd is so basely submissive that it will be itself the instrument of its own degradation. This is not quite true of most of the nations of Europe, though it is, as Tolstoï never tires of proclaiming, the logical end, the final point of military government.

On our old continent we see in our streets antique structures which were once forms of living thought; so we preserve institutions of the past logically out of harmony with the modern conditions that we call progress. The anachronism of the Emperor William is thus to be explained. But through the *débris* of the past the peoples are plowing their way. They have conceived the idea that men own themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and can and should freely dispose of themselves. By this the death-blow has been given to theocracy and to the rule of one man in the long struggle of the centuries for the vindication of liberty, from the times of classic antiquity to our day.

Despite certain relapses of adverse fortune, France of the eighteenth century, and the Revolution that was the outcome of the thought of its philosophers, completed—at least in doctrine—the emancipation of the intellect. America at the same period founded a free government, the vastest field of experiment ever opened; and Jefferson, in the Declaration of Independence, proclaimed, as the purpose of man's free activity, "the pursuit of happiness." What is the pursuit of happiness in the multiplied forms taken by the spontaneous or acquired manifestations of being, if not the tendency to the full development of life? But life, to be developed, must first be assured; and the problem of living presents itself before all other questions. Governments by authority have not solved it for the mass of human beings making up the social body; nor, as yet, have the governments founded on liberty solved it. To feed the slave as a beast of burden, denying him the poor favor of shortening his sufferings in the shambles, is the primitive method of sustaining the life of society, and is progress only as compared with cannibalism. The institution still flourishes among savage peoples; and down to the middle of the nineteenth century it prospered, on the American continents, side by side with the most remarkable organization of liberty won for Christ by the Anglo-Saxon and Latin races. And at certain points on the globe, at least, the experiment was pursued of assuring human life—the primary foundation of the pursuit of happiness—by liberty alone.

We are still debating the result of this experiment. The early theorists of political economy, with the fine confidence of men of pure doctrine, asserted—and not less presumptuously their successors continue to assert—that the one solution of the social problem lies in the magic formula of universal liberty. Meanwhile theory has been followed by practice. In the several lands under the variously named forms of liberty, what have we seen? All human liberties in mutual conflict in an inexorable struggle for life, ending in the inevitable subjection of the weak to the law of the strongest. Only appearances have changed. Doubtless there was progress, since for a time human energies were liberated,—but only straightway again to fall under the yoke of antique Force, mistress of the world.

Men must live: that is the supreme law. Is not he who strives

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for daily bread vanquished in advance by him who, commanding the means of living, exerts himself only to secure added happiness? What becomes of liberty here, when there is wanting the prime condition of its exercise—equality? To let loose in the world all opposing liberties, assuring nothing but an equal share of space and light, would be but to promise victory to the strongest. But what must it be when social inequalities, aggravating natural inequalities, give all the weapons to one, snatching them from another? What then is this much-vaunted liberty? Is it not of necessity opposed by the resistless need of individual appropriation, and by those fetters upon the spontaneous energy of the individual supplied by the social desire, which is at least equal to the aspiration toward liberty?

And this very liberty, this liberty of defeat for some, of oppression for others,—is not this deliberately perverted by the masters of political power, by those who dominate organized society, by the strong for the strong; combining all social forces for their own profit, claiming both the liberty of reducing wages to the merest possibility of life for the wage-earners, and the protection of customs tariffs for their own dividends?

In these conditions what is economic liberty but an elegant form of social swindling which saves appearances by means of argument, but in reality is hardly more merciful to the confused mass of the disinherited than those régimes not yet arrived at the grand conception of human solidarity? To-day, as in the past, the social deficit which is revealed in hunger, nakedness, and the long train of ills, can be met only by the uncertain chance of passing pity, by the hazard of egoistic charity in search of compensation beyond the grave. Charity was, in its time, a wondrous conquest, the unfolding of a sentiment of love that becomes nobler as it is more disinterested. We are still only too far from that ideal. But already in the actual stage of human ills, charity, individual or organized, has so palpably failed, that no one can expect from it a solution of the social problem. Besides, scattering charity, left to each one's impulse, even when reinforced by aid officially distributed, does nothing but make up the insufficiency of wages; and thus it perpetuates the very economic conditions sought to be remedied.

The precursors of the revolution of 1848, recognizing the failure of individual action in resisting the oppression of the individual, saw a supreme resource in association. The principle in itself is just; but it has only shifted the problem. Association of the weak was made difficult by want of discipline and adequate culture; and, if successful, it only delivered them, vanquished in advance, into the hands of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

associated strong. The idea cannot, however, be said to have been barren. Certain organizations for assistance, which on the whole have prospered, issued from this movement—trade-unions, syndicates, popular banks, coöperative societies. These at least, in view of the future, are signs of capital importance. But what has come from the concentration of the efforts of men who can contribute in any form only their capacity for labor, in comparison with the stupendous effects of the concentration of capital able to put the lives of thousands of men in the hands of one man, thus reëstablishing for the profit of a privileged class a power more formidable perhaps than ancient feudalism, the overthrow of which cost so much blood? Furthermore, these incorporated societies invite the savings of the working class—inadequate for their own emancipation—and add them to the accumulated capital employed by the masters of economic power to secure their domination. Thus the force of the subjugated helps to keep them under the yoke they have worn themselves out in trying to break.

In these conditions, what is more natural than for the mind that seeks the supreme liberating power to turn toward the higher association, decisive in its force—society represented by the organized action of the state? The idea is ancient; and, as the enemies of communism have admitted, collective property may be of remoter origin than individual appropriation itself. Even the most rudimentary civilization invokes the parallel development of two forces, individual and collective, and their expansion—by antagonism and by mutual support—in the diverse changes of human activity.

Aggregation is, in point of doctrine, the guarantee of the individual, whose welfare is the supreme end of the state. But the power given to some to secure this end has always resulted in the creation of dominant oligarchies. The social problem is to break down these and, if possible, to bring about the reign of justice on the earth. Is there anything simpler than that the total power, including all others, should be made to regulate the distribution of universal justice among all men, without distinction? The simplicity of the conception is the danger; for the individual groaning under oligarchic combinations feels but little reassurance in the thought of being delivered defenceless to the monstrous power of the irresponsible will of all. From this feeling, by a natural reaction, spring the claims of anarchy, proclaiming that the free development of the individual outranks every other need, and resulting in the ideal of the communism of liberty (*communisme libertaire*)—the harmonious outcome of the energies of liberated man.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are the two extreme hypotheses between which, doubtless for a long time to come, will oscillate the diverse socialist conceptions, ranging from the universalized collectivism of Karl Marx and the agrarian collectivism of George to the mutualism of Proudhon, or the anarchy of Elisée Réclus and Kropotkin. There is no intention, in this article, of expounding the doctrines of the different schools of contemporary socialism. Special books on that subject abound; and the theories are at the present time presented to public opinion in all countries where progress is active.

France—ancient land of revolutions—cannot remain in inert contemplation of the universal effort toward the social emancipation of the workers. In the past she has furnished illustrious thinkers by whom the first furrows in the long uncultivated field of social reform were broadly traced. Her form of government, purely democratic in appearance, seems to-day to enable her to place the study of the new conditions of labor, among a people eager to realize justice, in the front rank of her concerns. Only it happens, when we consider closely the course of the French mind, that we find it on the one hand prompt in generalization and bold of initiative in speculation, and on the other hand obstinately wedded to conservatism and routine in daily dealing with facts. We must therefore expect to find socialism everywhere *à la mode* in France, and socialist opinion remarkably active, and at the same time to perceive extraordinary aversion in the governing class—in deed, not in words—toward reforms which involve the right of social intervention in the relations of capital and labor.

Nothing is so characteristic of the present régime in France as the disproportion between the hopes it suggests to the French mind and the realities with which it pays such splendid promises. The incapacity to bring about the most timid fiscal reform in a country burdened with the heaviest debt and the most incoherent system of taxation is enough to doom to disappointment in advance all hope of social reforms. Perhaps it would be unfair to throw on the government of the *bourgeoisie* the exclusive responsibility for this state of things. It is true that no impulse toward reform has ever come from them, and that they have shown themselves as curiously incapable of directing the country in an evolution of peaceful liberty as the *ancienne noblesse*. It must be admitted, however, that the country itself, while it expects that the abuses of routine, which it tolerates with no adequate protest, will bring about those ill-ordered movements of opinion that are in the traditions of France, appears quite unable to impose on the government a syste-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matic effort toward reformatory action. This mental situation throws a certain vivid light on the present state of socialist thought and action in France.

To begin with that which is most ancient in history and also the latest comer in the social struggles of our time, Christian socialism has hardly more than a questionable and questioned existence as yet, in spite of the cautious encouragement of the author of the encyclical on the condition of the working class.

It will soon be two thousand years since Jesus of Nazareth passed through the field of corn with his disciples, and these, being hungry, gathered the ears and, rubbing them in their hands, ate the corn. This was on the Sabbath day, as the Gospels relate; and that was what shocked the Pharisees. "Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath day." And Jesus answered with the example of David, who, being hungry, went into the temple and ate of the shewbread and gave to those that were with him, which was lawful only to the priests. We note, not without some surprise, that the disapproval of the Pharisees and the response of Jesus relate only to the respect due the Sabbath, and not to the right of property, which the Christians of to-day look upon as the keystone of the arch of the social edifice. We must conclude that Jesus, who gave Himself but slight concern for the terrestrial domain, admitted, at least by implication, as a primordial law, that he who is hungry should eat. This principle, to-day universally condemned by established authorities, would lead anyone who relied on the Gospels straight to the prison door. Such is the effect of historic evolution. Pharisaism, overcome for the moment, seizes again its advantage under the disguise of new formulas. Millions and millions of Christians go on repeating the word of Christ while, in complete peace of conscience, practising the contrary doctrine. On the command, "Thou shalt not judge," rest all judicial institutions. It was a great discovery for the Catholic priests, in 1848, to find socialism in the Gospels. They had hardly got over their amazement when the *coup d'état* of Prince Louis Napoleon bade them attend to other business. They willingly obeyed; and to a layman, a soldier, M. de Mun—astonished to see the insurgents of 1871, shot down in heaps, "die with insolence,"—belongs the honor of having, in our day, planted the banner of Christian socialism on the loftiest battlement of the fortress of the Catholic Church in France. M. de Mun, who, to tell the truth, rejects the name of socialist, at first dreamed only of organizing the industrial world in syndicates of workmen and em-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ployers under the tutelage and arbitration of the Church. Later, questions of the regulation of labor absorbed all his attention. It is an open secret that he is acting under the direct inspiration of Pope Leo XIII; and it is a curious phenomenon that French Catholicism should receive from the very summit of the hierarchy the impulse toward social reform.

Socialism of the chair may be regarded as non-existent in the French Republic. The governing *bourgeoisie* have got no farther than the absolute dogmas of political economy; and that is one of the most curious symptoms of the mental condition of the Republicans in power. Still our people consent to follow, at a long distance, other civilized nations, by adopting for form's sake some of the laws for the protection of factory workers. But this is with so poor a grace that the law as to accidents to workers has been more than fifteen years before the Chambers, with no assurance that it will not take fifteen years more to pass it. I say nothing of the application of laws already enacted. It is, for the most part, singularly defective. Ask senators and deputies, and they will not absolutely deny the right of the state to regulate the conditions of labor; but they are careful not to accept the doctrine. That does not hinder them, however, from recognizing the right and duty of the state to protect their own industrial or agricultural incomes by customs duties as high as the patience of the consumer—weighed down by taxes for the benefit of the state and of individuals—will permit.

In these conditions how can we be surprised that official instruction —which, in France, is everything—is confined almost exclusively within the narrow circle of political economy. Thanks to free instruction, so painfully acquired, the modern notions of social justice are beginning to make their way. Thanks to certain liberal institutions —due to that private initiative so rare in France—professorships of opposing aims are arising face to face with each other; and our youths are beginning to understand that the determination of the laws of political economy by no means involves for us absolute submissiveness, since progress consists in opposing laws to laws for the well-being of man. Gravitation does not allow us to rise from the earth, nor to follow the course of streams against the downward current; and gravitation seems—does it not?—to be the sovereign law of the world. Nevertheless there are other laws—the reality of which is no less certain—ingeniously opposed to this supreme law, which permit us to be borne in the air and to mount the course of rivers at express speed. Why

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may not the laws of the distribution of wealth in a given social state be advantageously modified for the benefit of men in general by a new social state? Are we the inert slaves of political economy; or should we seek, in determining the laws of social relations, a means to overcome those who are opposed to man's full development? When this simple truth shall have penetrated the corps of instruction in the French Republic, socialism of the chair will be established in our country. As yet it is not.

As for the socialism which takes the name of "revolutionary"—and which may be called the socialism of the directed classes as opposed to the nascent socialism of the directing classes—that, on the contrary, is fully developing its thought. A part of the landed property—though less than is generally believed—is so minutely divided that there is danger in talking to the peasants of the nationalization of the soil. Right or wrong, and whether the mediocre advantages of the present system can or cannot be replaced by the still hypothetical advantages of some future system, our rustics are singularly rebellious toward anything that touches the fundamental sentiment of individual property. This is the reason why M. Jaurès himself, whose propaganda is directed to the rural as well as to the city population, has never been able to speak of the national appropriation of the soil, except with infinite precaution as to language.

The manufacturing workmen see individual property only in the most offensive form; viz. excessive concentration in the hands of one side by side with extremest deprivation for the many; and they very gladly join in a new development of social property, which appears to them to be the logical remedy for the ills they suffer. This sentiment is the foundation of the party of revolutionary collectivism, which, it would seem, may be regarded as the introduction to a régime of communism based on authority (*communisme autoritaire*).

Considering only the external facts, this party has made remarkable progress among the working class for some years past. Under the guidance and impulse of energetic chiefs, writers, speakers, and men of action, it has made itself a social and political power, and henceforth must be reckoned with. But, obeying the law of development of every organism, the party, as it has extended its area, has given rise to distinct aggregations, sometimes diverse to the point of antagonism. This is a source of strength or of weakness according to the point of view. My own judgment is that there is nothing better for the propaganda of an idea than diversity of groups. Concentration for the pur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pose of action suffers, of course; but, since the period for effective united action by the public powers still appears quite remote, no serious harm from this state of things is as yet shown. This united action is the mission of the national or international congresses, which are preparing for it by the maintenance between the groups of an adequate cohesion. Only this result must be obtained, as in every parliamentary assembly, by the action of the majority; and this sometimes aggravates the dissensions which it is intended to allay and to fuse in common action for the success of all. This was very noticeable at the last congress at London, where the French delegation was so deeply divided between men who aimed at political action and those who placed their trust wholly in action by syndicates or unions.

It is the wish of M. Jaurès that socialism shall take advantage of all the means of action offered by *bourgeois* society. The notion is a good one; and the first results attained certainly seem encouraging. Nevertheless when the chief strength of a party is in criticism, there is danger in assuming the responsibility for positive action in which the inevitable variety of temperaments must be reconciled; and this is especially true when a new ideal must be preserved as a source of inspiration and impulse in the mind of the masses, always simple and eager for encouragement. Doubtless this is the reason why M. Jules Guesde, that strict guardian of the dogma of Marx, has never tried to formulate the doctrine in proposals of law—to which his function as a legislator offered him seductive temptation. Unfortunately this prudence—if it be that—will be generally taken as a confession of weakness, so long as the doctrine is confined to theory and practical tests are avoided.

Whatever precautions may be taken, if one is in Parliament he must conform to the conditions of the parliamentary régime and, when occasion offers, present precise solutions for definite questions, as M. Jaurès has for the sugar question and the wheat question. This requires a good deal of effort; and it is not always appreciated by the purely militant section of the party, who regard the "parliamentarians" with contempt. The truth is that the advantage of an appeal to universal suffrage and of carrying elections is inevitably offset by the attenuation of theory required to bring together a sufficient number of votes from the various social groups differing in enlightenment and in interests. I should not venture to assert absolutely that revolutionary collectivism is diluted as it spreads; but I cannot ignore the infinite pains taken by a man like M. Millerand to make the transition easy for minds that, at the start, are frightened by the word "collectivism."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nothing could be more instructive in this regard than the discourses at the banquet of St. Mandé in 1896. It is true that M. Millerand entrenched himself behind this defensive formula: "*In my opinion no man is a socialist who does not accept the necessary and progressive substitution of social property for capitalist property*"; and M. Guesde hastened to interpret this in the narrowest sense: "*Like us, after us, Millerand declares that socialism and collectivism are but one and the same thing.*" But now notice the commentary of M. Millerand on his own words:—

"Is not the socialist idea summed up completely in the energetic purpose to ensure for each being, in the bosom of society, the integral development of his personality? This necessarily implies two conditions, each the factor of the other: first, the individual appropriation of the things necessary to the security and defence of the individual, that is to say, property; then, liberty, which is merely a sounding and empty word if it has not property as its basis and defence."

And farther on:—

"Collectivism recognizes that the nominal development of capitalist society substitutes tyrannical monopoly by a minority for individual property, the condition and defence of liberty. It does not revolt against recognized facts: it bows to them. It does not propose to reascend the current of the centuries or to arrest the transformation of humanity. On the contrary, it bends to its laws; and, since it is a law of sociologic evolution that all means of production and exchange pass from the form of individual property to that of capitalist property, its entire contention is this: In the measure that these immense capitalist properties, which dry up and destroy small property and individual property, are formed, in that measure social property shall be substituted for capitalist property."

Such collectivism as this, it will be seen, gives a broad basis for discussion in the parliaments of the *bourgeoisie*.

But by the side of parliamentary action, action by syndicates is going on. This is an organization of leaders rather than a popular one, and is a fruitful source of energy from which both the "anti-parliamentarians" and such deputies as M. Guesde and M. Vaillant intend in certain conditions to draw all the revolutionary force that it will yield. Consciously or unconsciously, with the help of some of the leaders and in spite of others, the idea in which, on the whole, this effort is crystallizing is to be summed up in one phrase—*a general strike*. Of course I do not mean to say that all the syndicates in France have set themselves this aim. That would be obviously false. What I believe exactly is that this idea floats as a sort of logical ideal of evolution over these rudimentary organizations, and might, later, if occasion proved favorable, draw in a great majority of minds. The absurd struggle of our industrial *bourgeoisie* against the syndicates, by turning them from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their natural field of action, leaves them no recourse but in revolutionary hopes. This result is equally due—to be just to all—to the lack of continuity in effort and the absence of discipline and method, which in France have prevented the great labor organizations from attaining the success of which we see examples in England and in the United States. The general strike is certainly not easy to carry out. But this idea of such a passive revolt, the potency of which would be decisive if it were really general, is calculated to tempt the spirit of theory and inflame the imagination of the industrial masses who are everywhere crashing against the *non possumus* of their masters. It is not surprising, therefore, that numbers of men—particularly those who prefer action to talk—rest their hopes on action of this sort, which, even if it led only to partial attempts, would none the less induce the gravest conflicts.

In opposition to the collectivist organizations, arises the force of the idea of anarchy. This is the natural reaction of minds which fear oppression by all for the same reason that they fear the abuse of authority by the few. On the side of anarchy is the resistless impulse toward liberty which grows with the development of the personality. Disregarding the acts of individual violence, which are generally condemned, and which, properly speaking, spring from no social theory and are the work of unbalanced minds, there may be recognized in the doctrine of liberty the indispensable counterpoise to socialism based on authority. Despite their refusal to let themselves be enlisted under the colors of any organization—or perhaps for this very reason,—the anarchists proved at the congress of London that they were a force with which in the future the socialist groups must more and more reckon. In any case they must at present be credited with certain intellectual forces in literature, art, and science superior to those that can be evoked by the other schools of social renovation.

This glance—superficial as it is—over what may be called the socialist mentality of the single country of France, suffices to permit us to appreciate at its just value the inept remark of the German dullard, "*Socialism long ago ceased to exist.*" Let us pity the man who in his innocence can utter such words; not seeing that the régime definitively doomed is that of which he is one of the last representatives. Government is made for men, not men for government,—that is the great conquest of civilization. Liberty without bread, bread without liberty,—these are diverse forms of the same servitude. The need of liberty in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action, the appetite for individual appropriation, must be reconciled in proportions changing with the necessity for social action, to secure the realization of the changing ideal of justice. The conception of liberty itself varies with the mentality of the social *milieu;* and the conciliation of the individual development of each with that of others will result not from an absolute formula, but from successive compromises, springing from the general achievement of human culture.

For the moment, outside even of the humanitarian question, a problem is presented which the sabre of the fierce von Gossler seems to me to be impotent to solve. Industrial production is encumbering our warehouses with an accumulation of goods which goes on increasing from day to day, and for which every one is seeking an outlet. Now these consumers, which are being painfully hunted for at the ends of the earth, exist in the very factories from which the manufactured products issue. They are the laborious masses, lacking the very necessaries of life, who would be the first to present themselves in the market, if their full value as consumers, after their function as producers is accomplished, were left to them by better compensation for their work and a more equitable division of the burdens of taxation.

Meanwhile production increases every day, the burdens of labor augment, and unbridled competition keeps wages at the minimum while their purchasing power diminishes. Thus the greatest outlet for industry is being closed by the extreme logical development of our industrial régime. Since the humanitarian sentiment has as yet failed to bring about a solution of the problem, the very vigor of economic fatalities, reacting from extreme abuses, must cause a better order of division to prevail. Thus, in proportion as emancipated man attains full consciousness of himself, the implacable greed of oligarchies, which deprive such an extraordinarily great number of workers of the products of their work, shall come to an end.

Doubtless we are not yet at this point. But we are already on the road to it. Lend ear, O sword-bearer of the German Emperor, to the vast murmur! You say, "*Socialism has ceased to exist*"; and Humanity with one voice answers you, "*Socialism begins.*"

G. CLÉMENCEAU.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED